

Jesus Christ A
SHORT^K DEFENCE

2

OF
THE DOCTRINE
OF THE

Divinity of Christ;

With some Remarks upon a late *Appeal to the serious
and candid Professors of Christianity.*

The SECOND EDITION.

To which is added,

A SUPPLEMENT,

Containing Observations upon a late *Familiar Illus-
tration of certain Passages of Scripture.*

*I will also shew mine opinion.
Speaking the truth in love.*

Job xxxii. 10.
Ephes. iv. 15.

L E E D S :

Printed for JOHN BINNS, Bookseller, in Briggate;
and sold by Mr. Crowder, Pater-Noster-Row, and Mess.
Richardson and Urquhart, under the Royal Exchange,
London; Mess. Merrills, at Cambridge; Mr. Prince,
at Oxford, and all other Booksellers.

[PRICE THREE PENCE.]

M. DCC. LXXII.

THE PREFACE.

TO write in defence of a doctrine, which has been so repeatedly and ably defended by many learned men; or to make any remarks upon a pamphlet, which has been already answered, may appear to some a very unnecessary employment. It may be proper, therefore, to inform the reader, that the following observations were written chiefly for the sake of the common people, who have not time to read, or money to purchase many books; and that no reflection is intended upon the Gentlemen, who have already published their remarks upon the *Appeal*. The Writer of these observations, imagining that the multiplicity of the subjects handled together in that pamphlet, tends rather to confound than instruct those, who have not read or thought much upon the subjects it contains, has chosen to fix the attention of his readers to one point, which certainly deserves the most deliberate consideration.

It is allowed on all hands, that the truth respecting this doctrine is *fundamental* in religion. If the Lord Jesus Christ is but a *mere man*, then the doctrine which attributes *divinity* to him is undoubtedly “a radical *corruption*” of the scriptures: But if he is so one with the Father as to be, with him, the *true God*, then to reject his divinity is a *radical error*. The reader, therefore, should consider well, that the subject before him is not of a trifling nature, and such as he may either embrace or reject with safety. This is by no means the case. If he is wrong in this matter, he is *fundamentally* wrong.

The first and great commandment is, that we should worship the Lord God, and him only. If, therefore, we either withhold divine honour from him who is God, or give it to him who is not, we are breaking that commandment, on which all the rest depend: We are either *blasphemers*, or *idolaters*; and we are assured, that none such shall inherit the kingdom

of

of God. Let me then beg of my reader to keep in view the importance of the subject, and to remember what is required of us in order to our preservation from fundamental errors. There are two things absolutely necessary: 1. That we pray earnestly to God for divine wisdom: *If any of you lack wisdom, let him ask of God.* Jam i. 5. 2. That we be sincerely desirous to do the will of God when known: *If any man will do his will, he shall know of the doctrine whether it be of God.* John vii. 17. Without these we have no reason to expect to be guided into all truth.

In the following observations I have referred the reader to the Word of God only, and to that as we have it in our native tongue: For to me there seems to be a great impropriety in appealing to the unlearned about any doctrine, and then entertaining them with criticisms upon the learned languages, which they cannot understand. If the persons appealed to are those who only know the English language, no reference ought to be made but to the *English Bible*. The Author of the *Appeal* thinks the lower class of people are as capable of judging concerning the important truths of revealed religion as the most learned; * which can only be true on supposition that the Bible, as we have it in our own language, is sufficient for doctrine, and instruction in righteousness.

The Writer of this Tract conceals his name for the reason mentioned by the Author of the *Appeal*, viz. "to give what he has written a better chance of being read without prejudice." And as he claims no assent to any thing he has said, upon his own credit or authority, his name would be of no service to the reader. The Bible, to which alone he refers, is open to every one; and he desires the reader to judge for himself, whether the sense in which he quotes any scripture be agreeable to the context, and to other passages, or not. He is not, however, ashamed of the doctrine he defends, for it is that upon which (after the most mature deliberation) he can cheerfully venture his eternal salvation.

* Preface to Mr. Elwall's trial.

He is free to acknowledge, that he daily *calls upon the name* of Christ that he may be saved; that he *honours the Son even as he honours the Father*; and looks for *grace, mercy, and peace, not only from God the Father, but also from the Lord Jesus Christ*. Wishing the reader every spiritual blessing through him, he begs leave to subscribe himself,

A Lover of the Bible.

A SHORT DEFENCE, &c.

I. **I**T has been objected to the doctrine of the *Divinity of Christ*, that it is *incomprehensible*, and *contrary to our reason*: On the former account, not the proper object of our faith, though it were true; and on the latter, not to be believed on any testimony whatever. Both these objections appear to me to be without foundation, though constantly insisted on by those who oppose this doctrine.

The thing proposed to our belief in this doctrine is this: 'That the glorious person, whom the evangelist St. John styles *THE WORD*, who was in the beginning with God, and was God, was made flesh, and dwelt among us, thus uniting in his own person, in an inexplicable manner, the divine and human nature.'

"We believe this fact," I say, "as a doctrine of revealed religion," that the divine and human nature are united in the person of Christ; "but as to the *manner*," in which they are united, "we believe nothing, because we *know nothing* about it; the sacred writers not having *explained*, that is, not having *revealed*, or made it known unto us."* We are, therefore, unjustly charged with making a thing *incomprehensible* the object of our faith; for the proposition which we believe is perfectly clear and intelligible: It is a plain *fact*, received upon divine testimony, which is the best evidence in the world.

And as this proposition is not *unintelligible*, so neither is it contrary to reason: For who can prove, that it is

* See Queries to the *Anonymous Answerer*, p. 19.

impossible in the nature of things, that the divine and human nature should be united in the same person? Yet good proof should be given of this before it be asserted, that the *Divinity of Christ* is a thing contrary to our reason, and such proof I am persuaded can never be given.

But here it may be said, that this doctrine, being founded upon that of the *Trinity*, is absurd and irrational, since it is impossible that three should be one, and one three. To this it hath often been replied, that the objection is full of ambiguity, and is either true or false as the terms are explained. If it mean, that three cannot be one, and one three, precisely in the same sense, the assertion is true, but it does not affect those who believe there is but one God, though subsisting in three *persons* (as they are usually called): And if it be asserted that what is *three* in one respect cannot be *one* in another, the objection is without foundation. The plain state of the case is this: The same scriptures, which constantly assure us that there is but one Supreme Being, whom we call God, do repeatedly ascribe the peculiar attributes and acts of God to *the Father, the Son or Word, and the Holy Ghost*; and lest we should thence imagine that there are three Gods, they likewise inform us that these *three* are *one*. *There are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost, and these three are ONE.* 1 John v. 7. So the apostles were commanded to *teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.* Matt. xxviii. 19. And since it has pleased *the one only true God* to speak of himself as if he were three distinct *persons*, although we cannot conceive what there is in the divine essence to render this the fittest representation of himself, we are bound to believe it upon his testimony who cannot lie, and who alone knoweth his own glorious and incomprehensible manner of existence. We have abundant evidence in the scriptures, that there *are* three who bear record in heaven, and that these three *are* one, and therefore we believe that *it is so*; though *how* it is so we *know not*, and therefore do not believe any thing about it.

Those who deny the *divinity* of our Lord Jesus Christ, bring us many passages of scripture to prove, that he was a man, and inferior to the Father; but these passages are really nothing to their purpose, for they do but prove what we ourselves contend for. We believe that the Eternal Word not only took our nature upon him, but also, that he sustained the office of *Mediator* on our account: That, through his own voluntary condescension, he was sent by the Father into the world; fulfilled all righteousness in our nature, and became obedient even unto death: That in consequence of this humiliation, he was highly exalted, made head over all things to the church, and constituted the judge of quick and dead: And that, finally, when the work for which he undertook the office of *Mediator* shall be fully accomplished, he will then lay aside the peculiar dignities of his office or *mediatorial kingdom*, and reign in the preceding dignity of his nature for ever and ever.

There is not, therefore, the least contradiction in representing Christ as inferior to the Father with respect to his human nature, yet equal to him with respect to the divine; for the different representations, and *seeming* contradictions in the scriptural character of our Saviour plainly prove, that his *compound person* partook of natures essentially different from each other. We use a similar manner of speaking with regard to ourselves, and on a similar account. When a writer calls mankind sometimes mortal, sometimes immortal; at one time corruptible, at another incorruptible; now vile, then precious; instead of charging him with contradictions, we immediately perceive, that he has a reference to those totally different substances, a material body and immaterial soul, which are, in an inexplicable manner, united in us. Let us use the same degree of common sense with regard to the scriptures, and all the difficulties concerning the character of Christ will vanish: There will then appear no contrariety in calling him the *Son of man*, and yet the *Lord of glory*. Luke xix. 10. 1 Cor. ii. 8. But it lies upon those who deny the *divinity* of Christ, to reconcile those passages of scripture, which attribute di-

vine

vine perfections to Christ, and speak of him as God, with those that are expressive of his inferiority to the Father : And till this is satisfactorily done, they must give us leave to think, that the former refer to his original nature, and the latter to his assumed manhood, and mediatorial character ; which appears to me to be the only way of reconciling those scriptures that otherwise would be *quite contradictory*.

The author of the *Appeal* says, p. 12. “ You have “ been taught to believe, that Jesus Christ was not *man*, “ but very and eternal *God*, without considering that, “ by thus making more Gods than one, you are guilty “ of a breach of the first commandment.” If he means to say, that the divines usually called *orthodox* teach that Jesus Christ was not man, the assertion is not true. Whether they are consistent in teaching this together with his divinity, is another question ; but that they do teach both is a matter of undoubted notoriety. They do not, however, by such doctrine, set aside that fundamental article of all religious truth, the Unity of the Divine Being ; but they speak of God as he is pleased to speak of himself, and think they cannot follow a better example.

II. There are certain attributes or perfections, which solely belong to, and characterize, the Supreme Being : These cannot be ascribed to any creature : Wherever we find these perfections ascribed to any being in the scriptures, we have the fullest assurance that such being is God ; both because they are incommunicable in their own nature, and because God hath declared he will not give his glory to another. Isaiah xlii. 8. But these perfections are ascribed to our Lord Jesus Christ in the scriptures, therefore he is very and eternal God. This I shall prove by the most clear testimony of God’s word, and then take notice of the principal objections which are made to this doctrine in the *Appeal*.

I. The *eternal existence* of the Supreme Being is one of those incommunicable perfections, which can be ascribed to no creature whatever. *Thus saith the Lord, the king of Israel, and his redeemer the Lord of hosts, I am*

am the first, and I am the last, and besides me there is no God. Isa. xlv. 6. This glorious attribute of the deity is repeatedly ascribed to Christ: *When I saw him* (says the beloved disciple) *I fell at his feet as dead: and he laid his right hand upon me, saying unto me, Fear not; I AM THE FIRST AND THE LAST.* Rev. i. 17. Again, *I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end, THE FIRST AND THE LAST.* chap. xxii. 13.

It is the character of the immutable and self-existent God that *he was, and is, and is to come.* Rev. i. 4. And this is the true character of Jesus Christ, who *is the same yesterday, and to-day, and for ever.* Heb. xiii. 8. He who, in the fulness of time, was to take our nature upon him is thus described by the prophet Micah. *Thou Bethlehem Ephratah, though thou be little among the thousands of Judah, yet out of thee shall HE come forth unto me, that is to be ruler in Israel; whose goings forth have been from of old, from EVERLASTING.* chap. v. 2. Hence our blessed Lord speaks of the glory which he had with the Father before the world was. John xvii. 5. And claims to himself that awful name I AM, which belongs only to the Supreme Being; *Before Abraham was, I AM,* chap. viii. 58. “Had our Saviour only said, *Before Abraham was, I was;* thus much at least would have been the consequence, that he had an existence before Abraham:—But now that he says, *Before Abraham was, I am;* something more is implied; something that peculiarly belongs to the expression I AM, and what that is we may learn from the original use of the words. They are the words which God made choice of to express his own eternity and power, when Moses inquired after the name of God: He answered him, *I AM THAT I AM.* Thus shalt thou say to the children of Israel, *I AM* hath sent me unto you. Exod. iii. 14. What now could tempt our Saviour to use and apply this expression to himself? He knew it never had been applied to any but God, and would have been in the man so applying it, in the highest degree, committing the robbery of making himself equal with God: Besides, according to analogy of language, the words
“ without

“ (without this construction) exprefs nothing : No idea
 “ belongs to them ; for a man cannot in his mind carry
 “ the prefent time back, and make it antecedent to the
 “ time already paff ; and therefore to fay, Before a
 “ thing was I am, is fhuffling ideas together, which
 “ can have no place in the underftanding. If there-
 “ fore you admit the expreffion to have any meaning,
 “ you muft allow the *I am* to belong to Chrift, in its
 “ proper and peculiar ufe, as fignifying eternity and
 “ permanency of duration.”* It is plain the Jews
 underftood our Lord in this fenfe, for they immedi-
 ately *took up ftones to caft at him* for his blaſphemy, as they
 thought it; and our Lord, inftead of attempting to ſhew
 them that they miſunderftood him, confirmed their
 apprehenſion by eſcaping out of their hands.

The eternal exiſtence of Chrift is likewise pointed out
 to us in that eminent type of him Melchizedek ; who,
 in order that he might prefigure him in this, as he did
 in other reſpects, had no beginning of days recorded
 of him : *Without father, without mother, without deſcent,*
having neither beginning of days, nor end of life ; but MADE
LIKE UNTO THE SON OF GOD, abideth a Priest con-
tinually. Heb. vii. 3. Our Lord was the root as well as
 the offſpring of David. Rev. xxii. 16. *David's Lord;*
 as well as *David's ſon,* Matt. xxii. 45. Which clearly
 ſhews, that whatever the Jews *did*, they *ought* to have
 “ expected more than a man for their Meſſiah.” It
 was owing to their ignorance of the ſcriptures in this
 reſpect, that they were not able to answer our Lord's
 queſtion, which he put to them with a view, no doubt,
 to lead them to the knowledge of his true character.

2. *He that built, or created, all things is God.* Heb.
 iii. 4.† But the Word, who was made fleſh, and dwelt
 among us in the perſon of Jeſus Chriſt, created all
 things. We are aſſured that the Almighty did not make
 uſe of any inferior being, as an inſtrument, in the great
 work of creation : *I am the LORD that maketh all things,*

* Biſhop Sherlock's Diſcourſes, Vol. 4. Diſc. 1. † If the reader
 will compare this paſſage with its context, he will find, that theſe very
 words are ſpoken of Chriſt ; though they are introduced here in that
 ſenſe only, in which no one will diſpute their meaning.

bat stretcheth forth the heavens ALONE, that spreadeth abroad the earth BY MYSELF. Isaiah xlv. 24. *I have made the earth, and man upon it : I, even MY HANDS, have stretched out the heavens, &c. ib. xlv. 12.* And, therefore, when the apostle says, that God *created all things by Jesus Christ.* Ephes. iii. 9. it is the same as if he had said, He created all things by *himself*, by *his word*, or with *his own hands*. The solemn address which the Psalmist makes to the Almighty, Psalm cii. *Of old hast thou laid the foundation of the earth : and the heavens are the work of thy hands, &c. belongs to Christ : Unto the Son he saith,—THOU, Lord, in the beginning hast laid the foundation of the earth ; and the heavens are the work of THINE hands. They shall perish, but THOU remainest : and they all shall wax old as doth a garment ; but THOU art the same, and THY years shall not fail.* Heb. i. 10, &c.

In the beginning, says the evangelist, was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. All things were made by HIM, and without HIM was not anything made that was made.—He was in the world, and the world was made by HIM, and the world knew HIM not. John i. 1, 3, 10.

The chapter from whence this passage is taken so clearly sets forth the divinity of Christ, that the greatest force must be put upon it, and the most unnatural construction made use of, to evade its testimony to this important truth. The evangelist assures us, that by the *Word* is meant God himself, and it is plain that the *Word* was Christ, for it was he of whom John the Baptist was sent to bear witness, and whose glory the evangelist saw, as the *only begotten of the Father* ; from whence it necessarily follows that Christ is God : And therefore this glorious person, whose messenger and forerunner John was, is called by the prophet Isaiah, *the LORD our God* ; chap. xl. 3. which is the incommunicable name of the Supreme Being.

The work of creation, which indubitably characterizes the Deity, is likewise in Col. i. 16. ascribed to our Lord Jesus Christ : *By him were all things created that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible, and invisible,*

visible, whether they be thrones or dominions, or principalities, or powers : all things were created BY him, and FOR him. The last clause assures us, that he was, in the most proper sense of the word, the Creator : all things were created BY him, and FOR him : BY him, as their cause ; and FOR him, as their end. By the same language is the Almighty described in other passages of scripture : as Heb. ii. 10. *It became him, FOR whom are all things, and BY whom are all things.* And in Rev. iv. 11. *Thou art worthy, O Lord, to receive glory—for thou hast created all things, and FOR THY PLEASURE they are, and were created.*

Can human language express any thing more clearly, than these passages of scripture express this great truth ; that our blessed Redeemer, the Lord Jesus Christ, is also the Almighty Creator, and, consequently, Very and Eternal God ? If they do not prove this, it signifies nothing attempting to prove any thing by scripture : Words can convey no meaning, but upon all language rests impenetrable darkness and confusion.

All the other attributes of God necessarily follow this of creating power. He who created all things must uphold all things, for this is equivalent to a continued creation : He must be every where ; and know every thing ; and he is the proper object of worship to all his intelligent creatures. These attributes are not only applicable to Christ by way of inference, but they are directly applied to him in the holy scriptures.

3. *He upholdeth all things by the word of his power.* Heb. i. 3. And, *By him all things consist.* Col. i. 17.

4. He is *omnipresent*, otherwise he could not be in heaven and earth at the same time, which he assured Nicodemus was the case, in that memorable conversation which he condescended to hold with him : *No man hath ascended up to heaven, but he that came down from heaven, even the son of man who is in heaven.* John iii. 13. The same truth is evinced from the promises, which our Lord hath made to all his true disciples, *Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them.* Matt. xviii. 20. And, *Lo, I am with you alway even unto the end of the world.* chap. xxviii. 20.

Whereas,

Whereas, on the supposition that he is a mere man, it is not only impossible for him to be with all his disciples, but he cannot be with any one of them, for he will remain in heaven till *the times of restitution of all things*. Acts iii. 21. But he is truly always in every place, for he can attend to the prayers of all that *call upon him*, 1 Cor. i. 2. *He is able to succour them that are tempted*. Heb. ii. 18. And to defend his sheep, *that none shall pluck them out of his hands*. John x. 28.

5. The Lord Jesus is likewise omniscient. Thus the apostle Peter addressed him: *Thou Lord knowest ALL things*, John xxi. 17. The Almighty claims it as his prerogative to know the hearts of men: *Thou ONLY knowest the hearts of the children of men*. 2 Chron. vi. 30. And this prerogative belongs to Christ. *Jesus knew from the beginning who they were that believed not*. John vi. 64. *Certain of the scribes said within themselves, This man blasphemeth: And Jesus, KNOWING THEIR THOUGHTS, said, Wherefore think ye evil in your hearts?* Matt. ix. 34. Jesus did not commit himself unto them, *because he KNEW ALL MEN, and needed not that any should testify of man, for he knew WHAT WAS IN MAN*. John ii. 25. *There were certain of the scribes sitting there, and reasoning in their hearts—and immediately, when Jesus PERCEIVED IN HIS SPIRIT that they so reasoned within themselves, he said, &c.* Mark ii. 6. 8. *And Jesus immediately KNOWING IN HIMSELF, said, &c.* ch. v. 30. It cannot here be justly said, that Christ might know the hearts of men by revelation from the Father, for the texts themselves guard against this perversion of their meaning by attributing this perfection precisely and absolutely to Christ himself. *He knew IN HIMSELF; and needed not that ANY SHOULD TESTIFY; which is not true, if Christ knew what was in men only by revelation, and not by his own inherent knowledge.* This perfection of God is thus expressed in the prophecy of Jeremiah: *The heart is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked, who can know it? I the Lord search the heart, and try the reins.* chap. xvii. 9, 10. And this our blessed Saviour claims as his own attribute. *All the churches shall know that I am HE WHICH SEARCHETH*

THE

THE REINS AND THE HEART. Rev. ii. 24. It is proper to be remarked here, that, notwithstanding this, our Lord assures us he did not know all things : For, speaking of the day of judgement, he says, *Of that day and hour knoweth no man, no not the angels which are in heaven, neither the son, but the Father.* Mark xiii. 32. This is as strong a proof of his real manhood, as the passages abovementioned are of his real Godhead ; and therefore when connected they shew, that our Lord Jesus Christ is God and man. Let but the reader attentively compare this scripture with those just before quoted, and he will find, that the application of those to the divine, and of this to the human nature of Christ, is the only method of making them consistent with each other. For as Christ is *HE who searcheth the reins and the heart*, which we see is the distinguishing character of God, he could have been ignorant of nothing had his nature been simple, or of one kind only : Or if he had known *all things* by revelation from the Father, there would have remained nothing which he did not know, on the same supposition : But now that *perfect* and *imperfect* knowledge are both ascribed to him, it proves him to have been partaker of natures, essentially different from each other. With respect to his *divine* nature, he *needeth not that any should testify*, for he himself *knew all things* : with regard to his *human* nature, he was capable of growth in *wisdom as well as stature*, Luke ii. 52. And thus, by comparing one scripture with another, we find an easy solution of the difficulty.

6. The blessed Jesus is likewise the *object of divine worship* : For, in the days of his flesh he suffered himself to be worshipped by his disciples ; after his resurrection, and ascension into heaven, he was worshipped by his apostles, who acted under immediate inspiration, and by the first christians ; and he is now worshipped in heaven by the glorified hosts of saints and angels.

And behold there came a leper and worshipped him, saying, Lord, if thou wilt, thou canst make me clean. And Jesus put forth his hand and touched him, saying, I WILL, be thou clean. Matt. viii. 23. *Then came she and worshipped, saying, Lord help me—Jesus answered, O Wo-*

man, great is thy faith. chap. xv. 25, 28. The blind man, whom he had restored to sight, said, *Lord, I believe, and worshipped him.* John ix. 38. *The apostles said unto the Lord, Increase our faith.* Luke xvii. 5. And Thomas, when his unbelief was removed by Christ's condescension, cried out, *My Lord, and my God.* John xx. 28. Yet none of them received the least reproof for mistaking the object of their worship.* It is true the word *worship* is sometimes (tho' very rarely) used in scripture for the respect which is due from man to man; but in the instances above mentioned, it is used in its proper sense, because it was accompanied with a confession of faith in him who was worshipped, and an express avowal of his being the proper object of divine honour. If we compare the behaviour of the apostles, under like circumstances, with that of our blessed Saviour, the contrast throws great light upon this matter. When the people at Lystra were going to pay divine honours to them, *They rent their clothes, and ran in among the people, crying out, We also are MEN.* Acts xiv. 14. And Peter, when Cornelius fell down at his feet, and worshipped him, *took him up, saying, Stand up, I myself also am a MAN.* Acts x. 25. It was not therefore "more common homage" and respect than the apostles approved of" which they rejected, but such as was not due to MEN. The angel who was employed in giving John the emblematical history of the church, rejected with abhorrence the adoration which that disciple was about to pay him, overcome with the grandeur of the scenes he had beheld: *See thou do it not; I am thy fellow-servant, and of thy brethren that have the testimony of Jesus: WORSHIP GOD.* Rev. xix. 10. If Christ therefore was not God, he was not only much inferior to this angel, but even to his own disciples, in his regard for God's glory, and the due conduct of his followers. Christ, indeed, rejected the honour which the young ruler paid him; because (as appears from the history) he had no knowledge of his true character; at the same

* See also Matt. xiv. 33. xxviii. 9 and 17.

time our Lord gave him such an answer, as would directly lead him, if he was sincere, to make the proper inquiry : For the question, *Why callest thou me good*, was doubtless put to him with the same design as that proposed to the pharisees, *How then doth David in spirit call him Lord*, to try whether they were able to account for it, and to lead them to the true knowledge of himself.*

St. Paul makes the worshipping of Christ, the characteristic of a Christian; which clearly proves that all such did worship him, and were instructed to do so by the apostles. *Unto the church of God, which is at Corinth, to them that are sanctified in Christ Jesus, called to be saints, with all that in every place CALL UPON THE NAME of Jesus Christ our Lord, both their's and our's—Grace be unto you, &c.* 1 Cor. i. 2. It appears from the inspired history of the primitive church, that christians had their name not only on account of their adhering to the doctrine of Christ, but also from their worshipping him, or *calling upon his name*. Thus Ananias, addressing himself to the Lord concerning Saul, says, *Here he hath authority from the chief priests to bind all that CALL ON THY NAME.* Acts ix. 14. And again, in the same chapter, *All that heard him were amazed, and said, Is not this he that destroyed them which CALLED ON THIS NAME in Jerusalem.* v. 21. Here there can be no reason to suspect that any “common homage or “respect” is meant, because the object of the respect was absent in body, and therefore *calling upon him* must imply a spiritual omnipresence in the person *called upon*. That our Lord Jesus Christ is the object of divine worship, in the most proper sense of the words, appears likewise from Rom. x. 13. *Whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved.* Which passage, compared with its context, abundantly confirms the truth I am defending : It is quoted from the prophet Joel, and is applied by the apostle unto Christ, who is therefore the Lord over all, upon whom we are to call for salvation : *If thou shalt confess with thy mouth*

* See Jones's *Catholic doctrine of the Trinity*, p. 13.

the LORD JESUS, and shalt believe in thine heart, that God raised HIM—thou shalt be saved.—For the scripture saith, *Whosoever believeth on HIM shall not be ashamed—the same Lord over all is rich unto all that call upon HIM : For whosoever shall call upon the name of the LORD shall be saved.* How then shall they call on HIM in whom they have not believed? And how shall they believe in HIM of whom they have not heard?—The same person is spoken of through the whole passage, viz. the Lord Jesus, and the apostle applies to HIM the words of Joel, which are applicable to none but God.

It is evident that St. Paul himself made Christ the object of his worship, for he prays to him as well as to the Father, in almost every epistle, for spiritual blessings upon those to whom he writes : *Grace be unto you, and peace from God our Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ.* So he prays particularly for the Thessalonians. *Now the Lord Jesus Christ himself, and God even our Father—comfort your hearts, and stablish you in every good word and work.* 2 Thess. ii. 16, 17. And in 2 Cor. xii. 8, 9. we have an instance of the apostle's praying to Christ on his own account likewise. *For this I besought the Lord thrice, that it might depart from me.* And he said, *MY GRACE is sufficient for thee: for MY STRENGTH is made perfect in weakness. Most gladly therefore will I rather glory in my infirmities, that the POWER OF CHRIST may rest upon me.* The blessing which the apostle here received in answer to his prayer was the POWER, STRENGTH, or GRACE OF CHRIST, to whom he addressed his prayer, as the answer shews, *MY grace is sufficient.* The holy Martyr Stephen employed his last moments in praying to this adorable Saviour of the world : *They stoned Stephen, calling upon GOD,* and saying, Lord Jesus receive my spirit.* Acts vii. 59.

The angels are commanded to worship Christ : *When he bringeth in the first begotten into the world, he saith, And let all the angels of God worship him.* Heb. i. 6. *Worship* must here signify proper adoration, be-

* The Translators of the New Testament have intimated to us, that the word *God*, which they here inserted, is not in the original, by causing it to be printed in the Italic character.

cause in the passage (Ps. xcvi. 7.) to which these words refer, it is expressly distinguished from false worship: *Confounded be all they that serve graven images, that boast themselves of idols: worship HIM all ye gods.*—
 ‘What invention could contrive a more positive and incontrovertible manner of calling the Son, God; than to say, *Let all the angels of God, or let other gods worship HIM.* What is this but to call him the Supreme God? And manifestly to make the distinction betwixt God by nature, and by office? All these gods by office are to worship the God by nature. *Worship HIM all ye gods;* and this the apostle applies to Christ, and says that it was spoken of him; and how to call him God more directly cannot be imagined.* Lastly, in the Revelations the heavenly hosts are represented as paying equal honour and worship to *him that sitteth upon the throne, and to the Lamb.* For unto Christ every knee shall bow, of things in heaven as well as things on earth.† *The four beasts, and four and twenty elders FELL DOWN before the Lamb.* Rev. v. 8. And again, *Every creature—heard I saying, blessing, and honour, and glory, and power, be unto him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the LAMB for ever and ever. And the four beasts said, Amen. And the four and twenty elders fell down and worshipped him that liveth for ever and ever.* ver. xi, &c. which is the attribute of Christ mentioned just before the opening of the vision, chap. i. 18.

Thus we see that the distinguishing characters of the Supreme Being belong to our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ; and to me it appears not more unreasonable to deny *humanity* to one that has the essential qualities and properties of a *man*, than it is to deny *divinity* to one that has the essential perfections and properties of *God*.

III. 1. In the *Appeal*, p. 13. the following text is produced to prove that our Lord Jesus Christ is not God: *To us there is but one God, the Father, of whom are all things; and one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all*

* Leslie's Socinian Controversy discussed, Dial. 2. p. 45.

† Compare Philip ii, 10, 11, with Isaiah xlv. 23. and Rom. xiv. 11.

things. 1 Cor. viii. 6. But in the sense wherein this passage is there introduced it would prove, that God the Father is not *Lord*, though it is his title through the whole Bible; for the text says there is but *one Lord*. See also Ephes. iv. 5, 6. The truth is, the apostle is here opposing the *one true God* to the *many idols* of the heathens, which, says he, are *nothing in the world*, possessed of no power or life, much less of those glorious powers, which distinguish the Supreme Being. He could not here be opposing the Father to Christ, because he ascribes to them a joint possession of the Divine Attribute of creating power. The Almighty is thus described by the same apostle; *Of him and THROUGH (or by) him are all things*. Rom. xi. 36. Here this character is equally given to the Father and to Christ. But who is he to whom the incommunicable attributes of God can be thus ascribed? Not a *mere man*, but he who *was with God in the beginning, and was God*.

2. A like argument is drawn by the same author* from that similar passage of scripture, John xvii. 2. *This is life eternal to know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent*. The sense of which, as of all other passages, must be fixed by comparing scripture with scripture. Now the title of *only true God* does not exclude our Lord Jesus Christ, because we are assured, that he is the *true God*, and eternal life. *We are in him that is true; even in his son Jesus Christ; THIS is the TRUE GOD, and eternal life*. 1 John v. 20.

3. The Writer of the *Appeal* tells us, that Christ was far from thinking of such an *impious robbery* as that of being equal with God; and refers us for the proof of this to Phil. ii. 6. where we are assured, that he thought it *no robbery* at all. Here we are informed, that the translation is wrong, and that the words in the original mean quite the reverse of the sense given in our English Bible. A little attention, however, to the scope of the passage will enable us to discern, that the translation is very agreeable to the context, and design of the apostle. The apostle is here exhorting to unity and

brotherly love, to abhor pride and vain-glory, which are the sources of strife and contention; *Let nothing be done through strife or vain-glory, but in lowliness of mind let each esteem other better than themselves*: And to have a tender concern for the welfare of others; *Look not every man on his own things, but every man also on the things of others*. To engage our obedience he sets before us the example of Christ, and shews us how great he was, and yet how low he descended for our sakes; *Let this mind be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus: Who being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God: But made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men, &c.* And as a farther encouragement to us, he reminds us of the exaltation of our Redeemer as the consequence and reward of his profound humiliation; *Wherefore God also hath highly exalted him, and hath given him a name which is above every name; that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, &c.* In this passage there are evidently three different states of Christ pointed out to us: The first, his state of dignity from which he descended; *Who being in the form of God*: The second, his state of humiliation, which he voluntarily took upon him; *And took upon him the form of a servant*: And thirdly, his subsequent state of exaltation; *Wherefore God hath highly exalted him*. These three states or conditions of Christ are essential to the apostle's argument: Take away any one of them, and the example which the apostle would propose is lost; the force of the argument is not only weakened, but the argument itself entirely destroyed.* If we set aside the first state, that of his natural dignity, the second will be no longer a state of voluntary humiliation. For if he was not more than a man, it was not owing to his humility, but the order of nature, that he was *made in the likeness of men*; and if he was but a creature, the *form of a servant* was as much dignity as belonged to him, for the highest of God's creatures are his servants. But it is plain that he was *in the form of God* before he was made *in the likeness of men*, because this

* See Bishop Sherlock's Sermons, Vol. 4, Disc. 1.

is mentioned as one instance of his humility. On the contrary, if it would have been an *impious robbery* in Christ to have claimed an equality with the Father in the Godhead, where was his singular humility in relinquishing this claim? To abstain from the highest insolence does not surely constitute any one a *pattern* of humility. Can a man be looked upon as *very* humble, so humble as to deserve being *highly exalted*, because he is not as proud as Satan himself? Common sense will not allow us to suppose the apostle would argue thus: 'Let this mind be in you which was also in Christ Jesus—who, having no pre-existence, humbled himself to be made in the likeness of men; and, being but a mere man, was so very condescending as not to pretend to be equal with God.'

This important passage of scripture is illustrated by 2 Cor. viii. 9. *Ye know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, that though he was rich, yet for your sakes he became poor, that ye through his poverty might be rich.* In this text is implied, 1. That Christ was rich previously to his becoming poor. 2. That his poverty was voluntary, the effect of his grace. And 3. That his riches and poverty refer to the same thing; to something which he had, and might have possessed, but which he willingly relinquished for our sakes, otherwise there was no humility, nothing worthy of imitation, in his example. But what were the riches which he possessed previously to his becoming poor? He had certainly none, unless we allow him to have existed before his incarnation. Nor can his poverty have any reference to his low condition on earth, which yet the apostle's argument requires, if we deny either his pre-existence, or his natural greatness and dignity. The plain meaning is, that he was rich in glory before his incarnation, of which he emptied himself, when he took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men.

4. In the *Appeal* we are informed, that although Christ says *he and his Father are one*, "he sufficiently explains himself, when he prays, that all his disciples may be *one with him and his Father, even as they two are one.*"

Our Lord's words are, *That they may be one, even as we are one*; not one with us, but one in us, as the context explains it, ver. 21: or *made perfect in one*, ver. 23; which, I apprehend, refers chiefly to that union, so often mentioned in scripture, subsisting between the true disciples of Christ, whereby they are one body of which he is the head. I would observe here, that the expression *even as* does not always denote *equality* in the sacred writings, but sometimes *similitude* only: As, *Be ye perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect.* Matt. v. 48. The scriptures speak sufficiently of our sinful and imperfect condition, to shew us in what sense we are to understand these words. The Writer of the *Appeal* will agree with me, I am persuaded, that the expression *even as* does not always imply *equality*; because there is another scripture, in which if he allows it to have this signification, (as I believe it has, because of the concurrent testimony of other scriptures) he will invalidate all he has said upon the doctrine of Christ's divinity.* The scriptures frequently speak of the union which subsists between Christ and his true disciples: but not in the same terms as of that which subsists between the Father and Christ: Nor is the glory which Christ gave his disciples, all the glory which he had with the Father: What he gave them may be learnt from what they received, which is thus described by the evangelist; *Of his fulness have all we received, and grace for grace.* John i. 16. But he had a glory with the Father *before the world was.* chap. xvii. 5. which certainly was not the glory which he received as man from the Father, and gave to his disciples. He had likewise such an union with the Father, that he could say with propriety, *All things that the Father hath are mine.* chap. xvi. 15. And, *He that hath seen me hath seen the Father.* chap. xiv. 9. But can every true christian use, with propriety, the same language?

Again. The union which Christ had with the Father, was such, that he might justly be called the Al-

* For the Father judgeth no man; but hath committed all judgment unto the Son. That all men should honour the Son *EVEN AS* they honour the Father. John v. 22, 23.

mighty's fellow : *Awake, O sword, against my shepherd, and against the MAN that is my FELLOW saith the Lord of hosts.* Zech. xiii. 7. But who, except the man Christ Jesus, dares claim this title ? And, the nature of this union appears in the strongest light from hence, that the Holy Spirit is indifferently called the *Spirit of God*, and the *Spirit of Christ* in the New Testament. *Holy men of God*, says St. Peter, *spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost.* 2 Peter i. 21. But this inspiration, as the same apostle informs us, was from the Spirit of Christ. *Of which salvation the prophets have inquired and searched diligently, who prophesied of the grace that should come unto you ; searching what, or what manner of time the SPIRIT OF CHRIST which was in them did signify, when it testified before hand the sufferings of Christ, and the glory that should follow.* 1 Pet. i. 10, &c. So the Holy Ghost, who dwells in the saints, is, in one and the same passage, called the Spirit of God, and the Spirit of Christ ; *Ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit, if so be that the SPIRIT OF GOD dwell in you. Now if any man have not the SPIRIT OF CHRIST he is none of his.* Rom. viii. 9. Our Lord assured his disciples when he was going to leave the world, that He would send the Holy Ghost to them, who should receive of HIS, and shew it unto them. John xvi. 7, 14, 15. But shall we ascribe unto a creature the power of sending the Holy Spirit, who is God himself ? 'A creature to send God ! And to give him something of a creature's to carry ! A creature to call God his messenger, and to say, *he shall receive of MINE, and shew it unto you !* A creature to say that all things which are God's are HIS !' This would be strange indeed ! He is surely more than a creature who can use such language with propriety.

5. "The term *God*," as is justly observed in the *Appeal*, "is sometimes used in an inferior sense in the scriptures." But always in such a manner, that "there can be no danger of our mistaking the sense" of it in such passages ; which, by the way, are very few. In these there is never any divine attribute connected with it ; but it is either in the plural number,

as, *I have said ye are gods*; or by its connexion evidences an inferior meaning, as, *I will make Moses a god to Pharaoh*. On the contrary, when the word *God* is used without any such connexion, and especially when any divine attribute is added to it, we are certain that the Supreme Being alone is spoken of. Thus the most clear testimony is given in scripture to the divinity of our blessed Saviour. He that, according to the flesh, was a *child born*, and a *son given*, is also the MIGHTY GOD, *Isaiah ix. 6.* The TRUE GOD, *1 John v. 20.* The ONLY WISE GOD, *Jude 25.* *Emmanuel*, GOD WITH US, *Matt. i. 23.* GOD MANIFEST IN THE FLESH, *1 Tim. iii. 16.* GOD BLESSED FOR EVER, *Rom. ix. 5*; whom the inspired Psalmist thus addresses, *Thy throne, O GOD, is for ever and ever, Ps. xlv. 6*; and whom *Isaiah* saw in his awful vision as the LORD OF HOSTS, adored by all the glorious company of heaven, *chap. vi.* compared with *John xii. 41.*

6. The Writer of the *Appeal* thinks our Lord disclaimed all title to the Godhead, in the answer he gave to the Jews when they accused him of blasphemy. *John x. 33.* They to whom that answer was given thought otherwise, for they immediately attempted to apprehend him, that they might punish him for persisting in his blasphemy, as they judged it to be, *but he escaped out of their hand, ver. 39.* When our Lord called himself the *Son of God*, the Jews understood him as claiming a divine character, such as could belong to no mere man whatever: And their behaviour upon such occasions shewed, that they looked upon this language of Christ as blasphemy, and probably as “an attempt to seduce them into idolatry; a thing which they durst not entertain the most distant thought of.” Therefore the Jews sought the more to kill him, because he not only had broken the sabbath, but said also that God was his Father, making himself EQUAL WITH GOD. *John v. 18.* And in the place above referred to, *We stone thee—for blasphemy, because that thou, being a MAN, makest thyself GOD, chap. x. 33.* It should be observed here, that the Jews had just before been requesting our Lord to give them a plain account of

of his real character : *If thou be the Christ (or Son of God) tell us PLAINLY, ver. 24.* To this he answers, *I told you, and ye believed not, ver. 25.* Now, can it be supposed, that he had told them he was but a *mere man*, and yet could not persuade them to believe it? No; he had expressed himself in such terms, as amounted to a declaration, in their apprehension, that he was *equal with God*, see chap. v. 18. To refer them therefore to his former answer, if he knew they misunderstood it, was “putting them off” indeed; and gives us no high idea of his integrity, or of the propriety of that title which is given him, *The faithful Witness*. But it is evident that they understood our Lord according to his own meaning, viz. as claiming an equality with the Father, for in that sense it was that they *disbelieved* his assertion. Again; If the Jews really misunderstood our Lord, then he persisted in deceiving them to his death; for he declared himself to be the *Son of God* before the Sanhedrim, as is recorded by all the evangelists, though he knew what idea the expression conveyed to them; and suffered himself to be condemned to death on this very account, without giving the least intimation that they mistook him, and that he meant to say he was but a *mere man*. So that if Christ was not God, equal with the Father, he was accessory to his own death, and therefore guilty of self-murder, since there needed no testimony but his own to clear him from the crime laid to his charge; and, in this case, the Sanhedrim did an act of justice in *condemning him to be guilty of death*. Mark xiv. 64.

7. In the great work of *mediation*, our blessed Saviour condescended to take upon him the form of a servant, and as the reward of his humiliation, has all authority and power over the church committed to him: In this *mediatorial kingdom*, he must reign till all things are put under his feet.* But when *the end cometh*, and the *last enemy is destroyed*; then shall he deliver up this kingdom to God, even the Father, and be himself also subject to him that put all things under him, that God may be all in

* Compare 1 Cor. xv. 27. with Phil. iii. 21.

all. 1 Cor. xv. 24, &c. Although the authority which he received from the Father as *Mediator* shall then cease, the work of *mediation* being fully accomplished; yet he shall still reign, in the glory which he had with the Father before the world was, and that for ever and ever.

Rev. xi. 15. He shall be, with the Father, the source of eternal bliss to the saints; and, with him, constitute the very glory of heaven. *The Lamb which is in the midst of the throne shall feed them, (the redeemed) and shall lead them unto living fountains of waters: and God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes.* Rev. vii. 17. And again, *I saw no temple therein*, says the favoured disciple, *for the Lord God Almighty and the LAMB are the temple of it. And the city had no need of the sun, neither of the moon, to shine in it: for the glory of God did lighten it, and the LAMB is the light thereof.* Ch. xxi. 22, 23.

The Author of the *Appeal* thinks, that till the doctrine of Christ's divinity, which he styles, by way of eminence, "the great corruption of christianity," be removed, it will be in vain to preach the gospel to Jews, Mahometans, &c. p. 17. I have shewn from the word of God, that they, both Jews and Gentiles, which were converted in the apostles' days, were brought to call upon the name of Christ that they might be saved; and I doubt not, but that the preaching of the gospel, where ever it is successful, will now produce the same effect. Instead, therefore, of adapting the gospel to the corrupt prejudices of mankind, let us join with the Psalmist in addressing our great Messiah, that, by the power of his grace, all nations may become obedient to the faith. *Gird thy sword upon thy thigh, O MOST MIGHTY; with thy glory and thy majesty. And in thy majesty ride prosperously, because of truth, and meekness, and righteousness: and thy right hand shall teach thee terrible things: Thine arrows are sharp in the heart of the king's enemies, whereby the people fall under thee.* Psalm xlviii. 3-5. AMEN.

SUPPLEMENT.

SUPPLEMENT.

SINCE the publication of the preceding little tract, the author of the *Appeal* has published an *illustration of certain passages of scripture* relating to the subjects of the *Appeal*, which, he says, may be considered as a reply to all the answers he had seen to that essay. I shall now take notice of that *illustration* so far as relates to the doctrine I have been defending, especially where a reply seems more immediately to have been intended to any argument contained in my *short defence*.

A few general observations have occurred to me in reading over this *illustration*, and comparing it with his *Appeal* and *Triumph of truth*, which I shall lay before the reader, and then proceed to examine what is said upon particular passages of scripture.

I. In the preface to Mr. Elwall's trial, &c. our author declares it to be his opinion, that "the lower class of people are as capable of judging concerning the important truths of religion as the most learned;" which, I have already observed, supposes, that the English translation of the bible is sufficient for instruction in these important truths. Mr. Elwall, who is looked upon by our author as an eminent defender of the truth, gives not the least hint that our English Bible is likely to mislead us in the doctrine of Christ's divinity; on the contrary, this doctrine is spoken of as being *clearly* repugnant to the Bible, and as a matter which any man of common sense may determine upon with the greatest certainty, provided he be sincere in his search of truth. "Nothing is more plain," says Mr. Elwall, "than that a deceived heart hath turned them" (who hold this doctrine) "aside, because they will not make use of those rational faculties which God has given them." p. 12. Accordingly he tells, p. 15, that the doctrine of Christ's divinity is the

the "master-piece of all the absurdities that ever were
 "invented:" and p. 16, that it is one of "the most
 "odious and absurd doctrines that ever was imposed
 "on mankind, directly contrary to natural and re-
 "vealed religion, and to all the rational faculties God
 "has given us." In the *Appeal*, p. 22, it is asserted,
 that "men of plain understandings never do believe
 "any such thing;" and that so far is the bible from
 giving the least countenance to this doctrine, that
 "it requires much *acuteness* to give it even a *plausible*
 "colour." Upon this allowed sufficiency of the Eng-
 lish bible, I undertook my *short defence*; not because I
 judged that our translation gave any advantage to the
 doctrine I defended, but that by appealing only to the
 scriptures as we have them in our own language, the
 controversy might be of more general use, and afford
 less room for vague and unsatisfactory criticisms.
 However, it appears that our author does not chuse to
 stand upon this ground, for in the preface to his illus-
 tration he contradicts, as I apprehend, the sentiments
 he had before espoused. He there tells us, that,
 "though the inspired writings were very intelligible
 "when first published, a long course of years has ren-
 "dered them *extremely difficult* to us, who use a diffe-
 "rent language, and whose manners and customs are
 "so exceedingly unlike the Jews:" that on this ac-
 "count, "the *unlearned* are very liable to wrest the
 "scriptures;" and that the passages of scripture which
 he has attempted to explain are, for the most part,
 "highly figurative, and *peculiarly difficult* to under-
 "stand." Besides, "one unfavourable circumstance,"
 he says, "occurs with respect to the right understand-
 "ing of the scriptures in this country, that the Eng-
 "lish translation of them was made at a time when
 "the christian world was but just emerged from the
 "darkness of popery, and while the belief of all those
 "opinions which are combated in the *appeal*" (and
 which he repeatedly calls the most absurd and impious)
 "were almost universally retained. Our translators,
 "therefore, having been educated in the belief of, and
 "in a reverence for, those opinions, and not having

“ had their minds sufficiently enlightened to call them
 “ in question, it is no wonder that, without any ill
 “ design, they should, in many places of their version,
 “ have expressed their own sentiments, and not those
 “ of the apostles.” If this be really the case, the
 condition of the generality of people in this nation is
 truly deplorable. We are to receive the bible as the
 word of God upon pain of damnation, and yet we
 are quite uncertain where it speaks the language of in-
 spiration, and where the sentiments of the translators :
 So that the gospel, which was intended, as this author
 speaks, “ to be the solid foundation of the faith,
 “ hope, and joy of *common* people,”* is become, ac-
 cording to him, quite insufficient to any but those
 who understand the greek and hebrew languages, and
 the common people have yet a solid foundation of their
 faith to seek. I am far from thinking that the know-
 ledge of the original languages of scripture is useless,
 or that our translation is not in some places capable of
 amendment; but I am persuaded, that there is not
 one doctrine of revelation destroyed by our trans-
 lation, or which may not be made out by compar-
 ing one scripture with another, without having re-
 course either to the greek or hebrew. I shall, there-
 fore, continue to appeal only to the English Bible, and
 leave to the learned those criticisms upon the original
 languages which they may think needful.

2. I have already shewn the consistency there is in
 sometimes speaking of Christ as inferior to the Father,
 and sometimes as equal with him :† The author of
 the *illustration* has not discovered the impropriety of
 such language, and yet continues to make use of the
 acknowledged inferiority of Christ as man and media-
 tor to prove that he is in no sense equal with the Fa-
 ther. When several passages in the Revelations were
 brought to evince the divinity of Christ, because the
 incommunicable attributes of God are there ascribed
 to him, and he is there represented as receiving the
 same worship as the Father; the *illustrator* answers,

* Appeal, p. 22.

† Short defence, p. 6.

“ it is plain the author of that book considered Christ
 “ as a person subordinate to the Father, and the mi-
 “ nister of his will, and therefore no single expression
 “ should be interpreted in such a manner as to make it
 “ imply the contrary,” p. 25, i. e. that Christ, as to
 his divine nature, is equal with the Father, for this is
 what he means by the *contrary*. * Now let any man of
 common understanding judge who it is that reasons
 inconclusively in this debate. We assert that Christ
 is God and man : the latter is allowed ; we prove the
 former from the ascription of the divine attributes to
 him, &c. To this our author replies ; those scrip-
 tures cannot mean what they seem to express ; Christ
 cannot be God, because he is man. Surely they who
 can argue thus should not think those who oppose them
 err “ because they will not make use of the rational
 “ faculties which God has given them.” Had this
 author made it appear that it is impossible the divine
 and human nature should be united in one person, his
 arguing would have been conclusive ; but till then it
 is just as weighty as to say, that man cannot be en-
 dued with an immaterial soul, because he has a mate-
 rial body.

3. I have before taken notice of the misrepresentation,
 which this author makes of the doctrine of
 Christ’s divinity ; † and am sorry to find he still insin-
 uates that we espouse the senseless notion of a plurality
 of Gods ; whereas he must very well know that it is
 as much our belief there is but one supreme *Being*, as
 that there are three *persons*, (as they are usually cal-
 led) in the Godhead. The *illustration* of texts relat-
 ing to the divinity of Christ is introduced with this
 observation, “ Nothing can be more evident, from
 “ the whole tenor of the New Testament, than that
 “ the person who is distinguished by the name of the
 “ Father is the only true God, exclusive of the Son,
 “ or any other being whatever. Nevertheless there are
 “ some single and unconnected passages, especially in

* Arguments of the same kind are used, p. 29, 31, 35, 37, and 40.

† See *short defence*, p. 7.

“our translation of the bible, which seem to favour
 “the contrary opinion, namely, that of the divinity
 “of Christ.” p. 21. This opinion, that there are
 more *beings* than one who are *supreme*, is no less con-
 trary to our doctrine than it is to common sense; and
 therefore, ought not to be charged upon us. Who-
 ever would prove that our doctrine is contrary to rea-
 son must shew, that it is impossible the Divine Being
 can subsist in such a manner, as to make it proper that
 he should represent himself as *Father, Son, and Holy
 Ghost*; which we, on account of the distinct agency
 ascribed to each in the scriptures, call by the name of
persons; hereby not pretending to explain the precise
 manner of this subsistence, but only using the fittest
 term which human language will afford to express this
 inexplicable mystery. It is not candid to misrepresent
 a doctrine we oppose; but this is continually done by
 those who deny the doctrine of the Trinity. If they
 would oppose us by rational arguments, let them not
 go about to prove that the existence of three Gods (a
 doctrine we abhor) is contrary to reason, but that the
 existence of a triune God is so. If they are conscious
 that they cannot demonstrate the doctrine, as we pro-
 fess it, to be absurd, let them not be unwilling to ac-
 knowledge this inability; much less persist in misre-
 presenting our belief, and then triumph in refuting
 what we never asserted. It is easy to avail themselves
 of the obscurity with which, in our present state of
 imperfect knowledge, we are obliged to speak of this
 mystery, and from thence to argue that we believe we
 know not what; but arguments of this kind may with
 equal force be used with respect to the very *being* of
 God, his *eternity*, *self-existence*, and *omnipresence*, of
 which we can not form more adequate ideas, than of
 his existence in a trinity of *persons*, as set forth in di-
 vine revelation.

4. In my *short defence* it was not my intention to
 consider the doctrine of the Trinity any farther than
 was necessary in speaking to that of Christ's divinity
 and, therefore, I did but quote two passages of scrip-
 ture expressly upon that head. The first was, 1 Joh

v. 7. the authenticity of which has, indeed, been called in question, and concerning which the *illustrator* asserts, that "it is not to be found in any ancient manuscript." p. 38. This assertion the reader may compare with what Mr. Jones has said on this subject. (See his *Catholic doctrine of a Trinity proved*, p. 63) There has been much disputing about the authenticity of this text. I firmly believe it to be genuine for the following reasons: 1. St. Jerome, * who had a better opportunity of examining the true merits of the cause, than we can possibly have at this distance of time, tells us plainly, that he found out how it had been adulterated, mistranslated, and omitted on purpose to elude the truth. 2. The divines of *Lo-veline* having compared many *latin* copies, found this text wanting but in five of them; and R. Stephens found it retained in nine of sixteen *ancient manuscripts* which he used. 3. It is certainly quoted twice by St. Cyprian, † who wrote before the council of Nice: and also by Tertullian ‡ as the reader is left to judge after he has read the passage in the margin. § Dr. Clarke, therefore, is not to be believed, when he tells us it was never cited by any of the *Latins* before St. Jerome. ¶ The *illustrator* adds, that allowing this text to be genuine, it is but "*supposed to contain the doctrine of the Trinity* ; because, in fact it expresses no more than that these three agree in giving the same testimony." If the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost are three that bear record in heaven, then the doctrine of the Trinity is certainly contained in this text. For since the inspired writers inform us that the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost is God, it must necessarily follow either that there are three Gods, or that these three are one.

5. The other scripture I quoted as teaching the doctrine of the Trinity was the appointed form of

* Pref. ad Canon. Epist.

† De Unit. Eccles. 109, Epist. 73.

§ Connexus patris in filio, & filii in paraclete, tres efficiuntur coherentes, alterum ex altero; qui tres unum sunt, &c. Adv. Prax. 100. ¶ See the text in his 2d edition. The reader may likewise consult what Calamy, Bengelius, Pool, Hammond, &c. have said upon this contested passage.

baptism : Matt. xxviii. 19. *Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.* Allowing the terms Father, Son, and Holy Ghost to be expressive of the only true God, the meaning of this passage is most obvious and natural; but with a socinian interpretation it will be difficult to make any sense of it; for according to this we are to be baptized into the name of God, the name of a mere man, and the name of the power of God, an interpretation which, I think, sufficiently refutes itself. In the *illustration* it is said, "This form of baptism seems to be intended to remind christians of the different parts which God and Christ, and the Holy Ghost, acted in the scheme of man's redemption," p. 36. What this author means by the Holy Ghost as distinguished from God, I am at a loss to conceive. After having informed us, * that by the Holy Ghost no distinct person is meant, but only the power and energy of God, or God himself considered as exerting his power, it seems to me to be as unintelligible to talk of the different parts which God, and the Holy Ghost, acted in the scheme of man's redemption, as it would be to tell us of the different parts which God, and the power of God, acted in the work of creation. Our author thinks himself vindicated in supposing that this text does not imply an equality of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, because "the apostle Paul says, 1 Cor. x. 2. that the children of Israel were baptized unto Moses, but he certainly did not mean that Moses was their God." Here, I think it plain, the apostle uses the term *baptized* merely in a figurative sense, or by way of allusion, and not in that proper manner in which it is used in the passage under consideration: For it was *in the cloud, and in the sea*, that the children of Israel are said to have been *baptized unto Moses*, and not by an ordinance expressive of any dedication of themselves to him; which shews that the being *baptized unto Moses*, as the apostle phrases it, was a very different thing

from that solemn institution of Christ we are now considering. Besides, it is not said, that they were baptized *in the name of Moses*, but only *unto Moses*; whereas we are to be baptized *in the name of the Son* as well as of the *Father*. * The apostle, who is certainly the best interpreter of his own words, shews us that these expressions are far from being synonymous; for he asks the Corinthians with an evident abhorrence of the thought, *Were ye baptized IN THE NAME OF Paul?* 1 Cor. i. 15; and rejoices that he had baptized so few christian converts at Corinth, *lest any should say he had baptized IN HIS OWN NAME*, v. 15. But surely, if this expression had only implied the being baptized into the profession of his doctrine, he would not have shewn such an abhorrence of it; for in this sense they might have been baptized *unto Paul*, as well as *unto Moses*. Whereas if the appointed form of this sacred ordinance intimates the solemn dedication of ourselves to him in whose name we are baptized, as I doubt not it does, the propriety of the apostle's abhorrence is evident, for no creature must be joined with God as the object of that dedication which we make of ourselves to God in baptism.

I might urge many other scriptures which contain the doctrine drawn from these I have already quoted; but at present, I shall but add one more, and this is the viith chap. of Isaiah, as expounded by the inspired writers of the New Testament. The prophet says, *I saw the Lord sitting upon a throne, high and lifted up—above it stood the seraphim—and one cried unto another and said, holy, holy, holy, is the Lord of hosts.* Here the heavenly host are represented as giving glory to the only true God; but this God is Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, if the language of inspiration is to be regarded. That the Father is here spoken of is allowed on all hands: that the Son is likewise here intended appears from St. John's exposition of this passage, who having mentioned the unbelief of

* We read likewise of some who were baptized *unto John's baptism*, but it is never said that any were baptized *in the name of John*. See Acts xix. 3—5.

the Jews notwithstanding Jesus had done so many miracles before them, ch. xii. 37. gives the reason of it in the words of the prophet taken from this chapter. *He hath blinded their eyes, and hardened their hearts, &c.* and then adds, v. 41. *These things said Esaias when he saw his glory and spake of him, viz. of Christ, as the context requires, who is therefore Lord of hosts. And in the Acts, ch. xxviii. St. Paul informs us that the words which the prophet received from the Lord of hosts, recorded in this chapter, were spoken by the Holy Ghost. Well spake the Holy Ghost by Esaias the prophet, saying, Go unto this people, &c. The Holy Ghost, therefore, with the Father and Christ, is the LORD of hosts whom the seraphim adore.*

7. In proving the *eternal existence* of our blessed Redeemer, I compared Isaiah xlv. 6. with Rev. i. 17. and xxii. 13. In the former passage the Almighty declares in the strongest terms that he *alone* is THE FIRST and THE LAST, and that this attribute belongs to no other being but the true God. *Thus saith the LORD of hosts, I AM THE FIRST, and I AM THE LAST, and BESIDES ME THERE IS NO GOD.* Yet with what solemnity does the blessed Jesus claim this glorious attribute of deity, when his beloved disciple lay as dead at his feet, astonished at the majesty of his appearance: *Fear not,* says he, *I AM THE FIRST AND THE LAST.* Now by what means could our Lord more clearly declare himself to be (as to his divine nature) the self-existent Jehovah, than by assuming this title? It is that which the creator has chosen to distinguish himself from every creature of whatever rank or office. I appeal to the unprejudiced reader whether it be a sufficient answer to this argument to say, 1. "That St. John elsewhere speaks of Christ "as subordinate to the Father, and the minister of "his will;" which, as I have before observed, is only declaring him to be likewise man, and does not in the least invalidate the proof of his being God-man: Or, 2. "That this high title is attributed to Christ "with respect to the state of glory to which he is ex-
"alted by the Father," when God has told us that
this

this title points out the distinction between him and every creature. Or, 3. "That Christ is likewise called *The Amen, the faithful and true witness, the beginning of the creation of God.*" p. 25. 26.

8. If the reader will attend to the argument drawn from our Lord's use of the expression *I AM*,* he will find, that it does not rest upon the mere use of those words, as the author of the *illustration* supposes, p. 41, but upon the manner in which they are used. I very readily allow, that our Lord might have said *I am*, or *I am he*, to any question respecting his identity without claiming an equality with the Father, any more than the blind man mentioned John ix. made such a claim, when he said *I am*, or *I am he*, to those who enquired whether he was the person who before sat and begged, v. 8, 9. On the contrary, supposing the greek words here translated *I am* to have been rendered *I am he*, the eternal existence of Christ stands as clearly evinced from his use of them, compared with the context, as if he had used that similar declaration of the self-existent God, *Before the day was I am he.* If. xliii. 13. The *illustrator* says, "the meaning of the passage clearly is, that Abraham foresaw the day of Christ, and that Christ was the subject of prophecy before the times of Abraham." p. 40. This I grant is the meaning of the 56th verse, *Your father Abraham rejoiced to see my day; and he saw it, and was glad.* As the writer to the Hebrews explains it, *He saw the promises afar off, and was persuaded of them, and embraced them.* ch. xi. 13. Upon this declaration the Jews propose a question to our Lord concerning his existence; *Thou art not yet fifty years old, and hast thou seen Abraham?* v. 57. To this our Lord answers, *Verily, verily, I say unto you, before Abraham was I am.* v. 58. He does not in this verse repeat what he had just declared to them in the 56th verse, but answers a question respecting his existence in the words of the self-existent Jehovah; and when they understood this well known language in its usual sense, our Lord confirms their interpretation by his silence, and by escaping out of their hands. 9.

* Short defence, p. 8.

9. Upon this passage in our Lord's prayer, recorded John xvii. *And now, O Father, glorify thou me with thine ownself, with the glory which I had with thee before the world was.* v. 5. the author of the *illustration* says, "this must necessarily mean the glory which was intended for him in the councils of God before all time, since in many other places the power and glory which were conferred upon Christ are expressly said to be the reward of his obedience, and to be subsequent to his resurrection." p. 40. Supposing what this last clause asserts to be true, that all the glory which was conferred on Christ was subsequent to his resurrection; how will this prove that the glory which was *not* conferred upon him was so too? Or, because power and glory were conferred upon Christ as the reward of his obedience unto death, how does it necessarily follow, that he had no glory with the Father before the world was? I confess I can see no necessity of such conclusion from such premises. The scriptures are as express in declaring that Christ had glory with the Father *in the beginning, before the world was*, as that glory was conferred upon him in consequence of his obedience unto death, and therefore we ought to believe both these declarations; nor should any one presume to deny the one because he acknowledges the other, 'till he has shewn that they are incompatible. It is readily granted, that Christ had not *that* glory before his incarnation which was the reward of his obedience unto death, and was subsequent to his resurrection, viz. the glory of his *mediatorial kingdom*, which glory will be laid aside when the work of mediation is fully accomplished, 1 Cor. xv. 24: But the glory here spoken of is that which he had when he was in the form of God. Phil. ii. 6. and which preceded his taking upon him the form of a servant, and his being made in the likeness of men. v. 7.

10. We are not told in the *illustration* how Melchizedec was *made like unto the Son of God*, in having no beginning of days recorded of him, Heb. vii. 3; nor how our Lord was the *root* as well as the *offspring* of David,

David, Rev. xxii. 16. I shall therefore leave the reader to his own reflexions on these passages.

II. I was not a little surprized to find it asserted in the *illustration*, that the address to God quoted from Ps. cii. in the epistle to the Hebrews, ch. i. 10. *Thou Lord in the beginning hast laid the foundation of the earth, &c.* is mentioned "without any hint of it's being applied to Christ." p. 35. I think this scripture is as clearly applied to Christ as any in the whole passage, which consists of texts from the Old Testament relative to the glory of Christ, except the 7th verse, wherein the angels are described to shew their great inferiority to him. The manner in which these quotations are connected puts this, I apprehend, beyond doubt.

Unto which of the angels said he at any time, Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee? v. 5.

AND AGAIN, *I will be to him a Father, and he shall be to me a Son?* ib.

*AND AGAIN, *he saith, and let all the angels of God worship him.* v. 6.

AND OF THE ANGELS *he saith, who maketh his angels spirits, and his ministers a flame of fire.* v. 7.

BUT UNTO THE SON *he saith, Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever;** a sceptre of righteousness is the sceptre of thy kingdom, &c. v. 8.

AND, *Thou Lord in the beginning hast laid the foundation of the earth, and the heavens are the works of thine hands, &c.* v. 10.

BUT TO WHICH OF THE ANGELS *said he at any time, Sit on my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool, &c.* v. 11.

* "These words" our author says, "may be rendered, *God is thy throne for ever and ever*; that is, God will establish the authority of "Christ" till time shall be no more."

This way of translating and expounding the text, appears to me very unnatural: The inspired writers often use the word *throne* in a figurative sense for the possession and display of glory, majesty, or dominion, but never in the sense here supposed. We often read of God's throne, but never of God being any one's throne. Christ is said to sit on the throne of God, and on his own throne, but not to sit upon God as his throne.

The conjunction *and*, prefixed to the quotation from the 102 Ps. in the 10th verse, refers to the applicatory expression, *unto the son he saith*, prefixed to the preceding quotation in the 8th verse, and therefore has just the same force as if it had been said, **AND UNTO THE SON HE SAITH**, *Thou Lord in the beginning, &c.*

12. I have already observed, that the first chapter of St. John's gospel sets forth the divinity of Christ so clearly, that the greatest force must be put upon it, and the most unnatural construction made use of to evade its testimony to this important truth. The illustration of the 14 first verses evidences, I think, the truth of this remark. *In the beginning was the word, and the word was with God, and the word was God. The same was in the beginning with God. All things were made by him; and without him was not any thing made that was made. In him was life, and the life was the light of men. And the light shineth in darkness, and the darkness comprehended it not. There was a man sent from God, whose name was John. The same came for a witness, to bear witness of the light, that all men through him might believe. He was not that light, but was sent to bear witness of that light. That was the true light, which lighteth every man that cometh into the world. He was in the world, and the world was made by him, and the world knew him not. He came unto his own, and his own received him not. But as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on his name: And the word was made flesh, and dwelt among us (and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father) full of grace and truth.*

Our author introduces this passage of scripture by observing, that "many of the texts, which are usually alleged in proof of the divinity of Christ, relate to God the Father only:" of which this is "one of the most remarkable." p. 30. Yet immediately after the quotation he says, "These words, interpreted in the most literal manner, only imply that *the Word*, or Christ, had a being before the creation of the world, that he had the title of *God*, or a *God*,
"and

“and was the instrument by whom the supreme God
 “made all things; but they by no means imply that
 “he was true and very God; for magistrates, and o-
 “thers are sometimes called *Gods* on account of their
 “power and dominion, in which they resemble God.”

p. 31. Now if by *the Word* is meant Christ, as the
illustrator here allows, how is it that this text relates
 to God the Father only? Nothing, I think, can be
 more arbitrary than such an assertion, when the evan-
 gelist expressly tells us, that the person concerning
 whom he wrote was the *only begotten of the Father*, v. 14.
 It is granted that magistrates are sometimes called *Gods*
 on account of their power and dominion, which they
 are appointed to exercise over others as God's vice-
 gerents: But the evangelist intimates that *the Word*,
 or Christ, was God previously to the existence of any
 creatures, with relation to whom he might be a *God*
 by office; in the BEGINNING, or from *everlasting*, as
 this term is used in Prov. viii. 22, 23, *the word was*
with God, and was God; and, therefore, he is *God* by
 nature. This important truth is repeated, v. 2, *The*
same was in the beginning with God: And then we are
 informed that *all things were made by him, and without*
him was not any thing made that was made. v. 3. Our
 author thinks “the derivation of Christ from the
 “Father, and consequently his dependance upon him,
 “is sufficiently expressed by his being called, in the
 “last of these verses, *the only begotten of the Father*.”
 I have elsewhere shewn in what sense our Lord is cal-
 led the *Son of God*,* and therefore shall not now en-
 large on this subject: I would here only observe, that
 the appellation used in this passage shews that Christ
 is not called the *Son of God* in the same sense as holy
 men are in scripture, but in a sense peculiar to himself,
 otherwise he could not be styled the *ONLY begotten of*
the Father.

The most literal interpretation of this passage does
 not, however, exactly suit our author's sentiments; for

* *Short Defence*, p. 23.

he adds, "to me it appears, that the apostle does not speak of the pre-existence of Christ in this place; but only of the power and wisdom of God, which dwelled, or tabernacled in his flesh." And again, "By *the word of God*, we are not to understand any being distinct from God; but only the *power* or *energy of God*, which is so much *with God*, that it properly belongs to his nature, and is not at all distinct from God himself; and that the same power which produced all things was manifest to men in the person of Jesus Christ." This *illustration* is more distant from the evident scope of the passage than the former; and disfigures this plain, and connected discourse of the apostle with a most unaccountable repetition of something quite foreign to his purpose. According to the *illustrator* we are to suppose, that the evangelist introduces his account of the incarnation of Christ, and of his solemn inauguration into his prophetic office on earth, by repeatedly telling us, that power was with God from the beginning, and that power was so much with God, that it properly belonged to his nature; that all things were made by power, and that without power was not any thing made that was made. Now can any man, who will make use of the rational faculties which God has given him, believe that this is the apostle's meaning? I am sure if it is, the art of criticism must be racked to discover the connexion of his discourse. Whereas, allowing the doctrine of Christ's Divinity, nothing can be more intelligible than the sense of the three first verses, or more natural than their connexion with the subsequent part of the chapter.

Besides, the evangelist says several things of *the Word*, which are not applicable to power, wisdom, or any *quality*, but evidently belong to a *person*; which demonstrates that he is not speaking of a *quality*, but a *person*. *John came for a witness, to bear witness of the light, that all men through him might believe: He was not that light, but was sent to bear witness of that light.* Surely the evangelist did not mean to inform us, that John was not wisdom, or that wisdom did not reside

in

in John; but that he was not *the Christ*, that person of whom he is speaking throughout the passage. Again, *He was in the world, and the world was made by HIM, and the world knew HIM not. He came unto HIS own, and HIS own received HIM not. But as many as received HIM, to them gave HE power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on HIS NAME.* It is plain, I think, that the relatives in this sentence refer to the same antecedent, and that the antecedent referred to is he on whose name we are to believe for salvation, the Lord Jesus Christ. Again, *The word was made flesh, and dwelt among us, and we beheld HIS glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth.* The evangelist in this verse likewise puts beyond doubt what he means by *the Word*, for he calls him *the only begotten of the Father*, a title appropriated to Christ.

13. An exposition equally strange with the preceding does this author give of Col. i. 16. *For by him were all things created that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible; whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers; all things were created by him, and for him.* "In this passage," he says, "we have a view given us of the great and happy change that was made in the world by the gospel; for by creation we are to understand the new creation, or renovation, in which sense, the same word is used by the apostle, Eph. ii. 10." p. 44. It is very true, that the words generally rendered *to create* or *creation*, are used in scripture to express the great change produced in the tempers and conduct of men by the gospel; As, *If any man be in Christ he is a new creature.* 2 Cor. v. 17. And, *We are his workmanship created in Christ Jesus unto good works.* Eph. ii. 10. But because the word *creation* is sometimes used to express the renovation of mens minds, it will by no means follow, that it must have the same signification in this passage: For it is not *men* only who are here said to have been created by Christ, but *all things*; things *invisible*, as well as *visible*; things *in heaven*, as well as things on earth: And is this giving us a view

of the change produced in the world by the gospel? Were things in heaven depraved, that they needed any change of temper? Or was the gospel sent to things invisible, to thrones, dominions, principalities, and powers, to engage them to change their conduct? If the words of scripture have so little connexion with the sense, as this *illustration* supposes, it will be no hard matter to make them prove any thing. The change produced in the minds of men by divine grace through the gospel, is very fitly called a *renovation*, or *new creation*, because it really is so: it is the making of what did not exist before, the creation of new principles of action, new tempers, and dispositions; but that the invisible powers in heaven need any such renovation is contradicted by all the accounts we have of them in scripture. The glory of Christ as head of the church, mentioned in the 18th verse, and in Ephes. i. 20—23. is distinguished from that which he has as Creator of all things, as I have already observed,* and as appears from comparing the 16th and 18th verses of this chapter.

14. In my proof of Christ's *omnipresence* I mentioned that conversation with Nicodemus, in which our Lord speaks of himself as being in heaven, and on earth, at the same time. The author of the *illustration* thinks this mode of expression to signify only "a state of intimate communication with God," and asserts that "the notion of a local heaven above the clouds is altogether fanciful." p. 42. I shall not enter into a debate with him about the locality of heaven, but thus much I would observe by the way, that since the word of God, in its least figurative expressions concerning heaven, intimates a locality, we have not sufficient ground from scripture to treat such a notion as a mere fancy. Many mere men have enjoyed very intimate communication with God, as Moses, with whom God spake *face to face, as a man speaketh unto his friend*, Exod. xxxiii. 11. Yet of him, or of any other, is it not said, that he was in heaven and earth at the same time; but the being in

* *Short defence*, p. 6, 19.

heaven is spoken of in scripture as inconsistent with a state of mere humanity on earth: As 2 Cor. v. 6, 8. *While we are at home in the body, we are absent from the Lord.* I do not pretend to form any idea of the manner in which St. Paul was caught up into the third heaven, since he himself has declared he was ignorant of it, and knew not whether he was in the body, or out of the body. 2 Cor. xii. 2.

15. That our blessed Redeemer is really present, as to his divine nature, with all his disciples, at all times, and in all places, I think, is evident from the scriptures I have quoted in the *defence*, p. 11. Our author has commented upon those taken from St. Matthew's gospel: In *illustrating* that promise of our Lord mentioned ch. xxviii. 29. *Lo, I am with you alway even unto the end of the world*, he says, "Christ, who is constituted head over all things to his church, undoubtedly takes care of its interests, and attends to whatever concerns his disciples; and *being with* a person, and *taking care* of him are, in the language of scripture, equivalent expressions." p. 26. to prove which we are referred to some texts in Genesis, where God is said to have *been with* Ishmael, Abraham, Jacob, and Joseph. See Gen. xxi. 20, 22. xxviii. 15. xxxix. 2. But these passages make against our author's *illustration*: For from them we learn, that when God promises to *be with* any one, he means that he will be really present with him to do him good: And so we are to understand our Lord when he makes the same promise; that he will not only be present with his disciples, but present with them to bless, and guide, and preserve them. Because *being with* a person in the language of the Old Testament implies a *favourable presence*, it surely can never be deduced from hence; that the same phrase in the New Testament implies no presence at all, but only the favour of an absent person. The *illustrator* adds, that "Christ may even *be personally present* with his disciples when they little think of it. But it is by no means necessary that he be personally present every where at the same time; since God may communicate to him a power
" of

"of knowing distant events." ib. I have given a reason in my *short defence*, p. 11. why I think our Lord is not present *in body* with any of his disciples, for this is the *personal presence* our author speaks of; but if he was, this would not fulfil the promise, which is general, and belongs as much to one disciple as another, yet he cannot be present always in body with two distant disciples. We cannot doubt of God's power to communicate the knowledge of distant events to any man, but this knowledge, though attended with a concern in the events made known, is a very different thing from the matter of the promise we are now considering.

16. The meaning of that similar passage, Matt. xviii. 20. *Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them*, our author thinks to be only a representation of the great efficacy of the apostles' prayers, so that when praying assembled as became the disciples of Christ, their power with God was the same as his power. "That our Lord could not intend to speak of himself as the God who heareth prayer, is evident," he says, "from his speaking of the Father, in this very place, as the person who was to grant their petitions, v. 19. *Again I say unto you, that if two of you shall agree on earth, touching any thing that they shall ask, it shall be done for them of my Father who is in heaven.*" p. 27. That the efficacy of social prayer is represented in this passage is indeed evident; but that our Lord is really present with his faithful disciples, when engaged in this solemn exercise, is equally evident from his own plain declaration, *there am I in the midst of them*.

Whether in this passage he intended, or not, to speak of himself *as the God that heareth prayer*, does not alter the argument: He speaks of himself as being present in various places at the same time, which is sufficient for the proof of his *omnipresence*, and that was all I brought this text to prove. However, it is probable that he meant to speak of himself here, as it is certain he doth elsewhere, as the favourable answerer of humble prayer, *If ye shall ask any thing in my name, I WILL DO IT.* John xiv. 14.

17. I do not find in the *illustration* any direct answer to what I have advanced on the article of Christ's omniscience; I shall not, therefore, at present add any thing upon that head.

18. No reply is likewise given to several of the arguments I have brought in proof of *divine worship* being paid to Christ;* and some of the arguments urged in the *appeal* are repeated in the *illustration*, § without any notice taken of the answers to them.

In the former edition of my *short defence* I said, that *calling upon* or invoking, and *calling upon his name*, were terms appropriated in scripture to *divine worship*. My meaning was not "that the greek word rendered in 1 Cor. i. 2. to *call upon* was appropriated to *invocation* as peculiar to the Divine Being." I was aware that the same word is used to express St. Paul's *appealing* to Cæsar, Acts xxv. 21, &c. and likewise the giving a surname to a person, as *Judas surnamed Iscariot*, Luke xxii. 3. But, speaking to those who did not understand the greek language, I remarked, that although it was very true, as the author of the *appeal* had observed, that the word *worship* was sometimes used for the respect due from man to man; yet that wherever the term *calling upon* was used in our English Bible as expressive of *solemn invocation*, there *divine worship* was intended. Although I believe this remark to be very true, yet I freely acknowledge it is wanting in propriety. As the original word does not always signify *divine invocation*, to use it as an argument, that it has always this meaning when thus translated, I confess is begging the question, and taking that for granted which ought to have been proved only from the scope of the passages quoted, compared with parallel places of scripture. However, the force of the arguments used to prove the worship of Christ from those texts where he is said to be *called upon*, does not

* As those taken from Rom. x. 13—15. 2 Cor. xii. 8, 9. 2 Thess. ii. 16. Heb. i. 6. Rev. v. 8, 11. *Short defence*, p. 13—17.

§ As that drawn from the different senses of the word *worship* under this head; and others elsewhere.

depend upon this remark, as, I hope, is sufficiently shewn in my *short defence*.

In order to *illustrate* 1 Cor. i. 2. where the apostle addresses the whole body of Christians as those that *call upon the name of Jesus Christ our Lord*, our author says, "That adoration, such as is due to the one living and true God, was not meant by the apostle in this place, is evident from the very next words; *Grace be with you, and peace from God our Father, and from the Lord Jesus Christ*; where Christ is evidently spoken of as distinct from God." p. 37. Now, in my apprehension, the very reverse is the conclusion which these words require: for if the apostle prays for *grace and peace*, which include all spiritual blessings, from the Lord Jesus Christ, as well as from God the Father, it necessarily follows, that he makes Christ the object of the same worship as the Father. The distinct mention of Christ in this place can only prove that Christ is not the Father: but the joining of Christ with the Father in the same address can never prove that Christ is not God as well as the Father. With more appearance of reason might it be urged, that because the Holy Ghost is distinctly mentioned with God in that apostolic benediction, *The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the Love of God, and the fellowship of the Holy Ghost, be with you all*, therefore the Holy Ghost is not God: yet our author thinks this no objection to his believing that the Holy Ghost is not distinct from God at all.

19. The address of the expiring martyr St. Stephen to the Lord Jesus, Acts vii. 59, is thus commented upon in the *illustration*, p. 37. "This text by no means implies that Stephen acknowledged Christ to be God, but only informs us, that Stephen addressed himself to Christ, whom he had just seen in person, in a state of great exaltation and glory." The text informs us that Stephen called upon, or invoked Christ, and gives us the very words of his invocation; *They stoned Stephen, calling upon, or invoking, and saying, Lord Jesus receive my spirit*. He recommends his soul into the hands of Christ, and implores

implores of him a reception into glory; and if this be not praying to him, I know not what is. An address made by an inspired person, in a time of the greatest distress, when none but God could help him, containing a supplication for the greatest blessing, and the crown of all others, a reception into glory, contains every thing necessary to constitute it *prayer*, in the most proper sense of the word; and therefore I cannot doubt that Stephen truly prayed to the Lord Jesus. May I, and may the author of this *illustration*, be found in our last moments, in the exercise of such faith, and such prayer as this holy martyr, and obtain like him a gracious reception in the realms of bliss and glory!

The reasoning which follows the *illustration* of this text is very far from being conclusive. Our author having observed that the word which is here, and in 1 Cor. i. 2. rendered to *call upon* is likewise rendered to *appeal to*, and is used to express the *surname* of a person, infers this consequence, "There can be no doubt, therefore, but that it has the same meaning both in 1 Cor. i. 2. and also in Acts ix. 21. *Is not this he that destroyed them who called on this name in Jerusalem?* that is, all who called themselves *christians.*" By the *same meaning* I suppose our author intends that expressed in the latter sentence, or he cannot mean the sense of both, or of either indifferently, as they are widely different. But this consequence has no connexion with its premisses, as the reader will immediately perceive upon stating the argument. 'The word usually translated to *call upon* signifies in Luke xxii. 3. to be *called by a particular name*, in Acts xxv. 21. to *appeal to*, and in Acts vii. 59. to *address a person*; therefore in 1 Cor. i. 2. and Acts ix. 21. it signifies to be called by a particular name.' Our author adds, "The word is so rendered, James ii. 7. *Do they not blaspheme that worthy name, by which ye are called?* or, as it is more exactly rendered, *which is called*, or imposed, upon you; that is, by which ye are distinguished. Had it implied *adoration*, it would at least have been

" *which*

"which is called upon by you." I grant it, and therefore believe, that in James ii. 7. it does not mean *adoration* any more than it does in Luke xxii. 3. as the construction of the words evinces.

There are very few words in our own, or perhaps any other language, which do not admit of more senses than one; yet this does not hinder, but that the particular sense of a word may be so determined by its connexion with other words in the same sentence, that it cannot in such sentence admit of more than one signification. This remark I could wish the reader to keep in view through the whole of this controversy; and it is very applicable to the subject under consideration. The word commonly rendered *calling upon* signifies Luke xxii. 3. to be *surnamed*, and can there signify nothing else, as is plain from the connexion; *Then entered Satan into Judas SURNAMED Iscariot, being one of the twelve.* On the other hand, the same word in Rom. x. 12, &c. does as certainly signify *divine worship* or *adoration* in the most proper sense, the meaning being likewise absolutely determined by the connexion. *The same Lord over all is rich unto all that CALL UPON him. For whosoever shall CALL UPON the name of the Lord shall be saved.*

20. That Thomas paid such proper *adoration* to our Lord, I think, is plain from the account given of it, John xx. 28. *Thomas answered and said unto him, My Lord, and my God.* "This," says the *illustrator*, "is an abrupt exclamation, and no connected sentence at all, and seems to have proceeded from a conviction, suddenly produced in the apostle's mind, that he who stood before him was, indeed, his Lord and master raised to life by the power of God." p. 33. What sort of argument our author intends by saying, the apostle's words "are no connected sentence at all," I cannot comprehend: they seem to me to have all the connexion that any exclamation has; they arise from the event, and express the sentiments of the speaker, which were, as we may conclude from the best authority, that he who stood before him was his Lord and his God. In

the illustration of this text our author adds some passages of scripture, which speak of Christ as raised from the dead by the power of God; as Rom. vi. 4. *Raised from the dead by the glory of the Father,* x. 9. *If thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe with thine heart, that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved.* And then says, "Here we plainly see, that he only who raised Christ from the dead is stiled God, and not Christ, who was raised by his power." p. 34. This argument, I apprehend, is very unfavourable to the cause it is designed to support; for if the being stiled God is a proof of divinity, then the divinity of Christ is proved, since he is repeatedly stiled God in the most solemn manner in scripture. Or, if the raising Christ from the dead proves the almighty power of him who raised him, then almighty power belongs to Christ, for he raised himself, if he fulfilled his own declaration. *Destroy this temple, and in three days I WILL RAISE IT UP.* John ii. 19. See also Chap. x. 18.

21. In the illustration of I John v. 20. *We know that the Son of God is come, and hath given us an understanding that we may know him that is true: and we are in him that is true, even in his Son Jesus Christ.* This is the true God, and eternal life; our author says, p. 32. "The last clause is manifestly explanatory of the title *him that is true*, or *the true one*, in the preceding clauses." This observation which supposes the title *he that is true* to be the peculiar attribute of the true God, confirms the doctrine which it aims to overturn; for this is the title by which the same apostle elsewhere speaks of Christ. As Rev. iii. 7. *These things saith he that is holy, HE THAT IS TRUE, he that hath the key of David, he that openeth and no man shutteth; and shutteth and no man openeth.* These appellations *the holy one*, and *the true one*, are used in many places of scripture as characteristic of the Almighty, yet we see they belong to Christ; which manifestly proves him to be the true God. Indeed this book of the Revelation which concludes the sacred code, repeatedly speaks of the Father and of Christ

in the same terms,* represents them as addressed with the same worship,† and declares them to be equally the source of eternal bliss to the happy company of heaven. § The *illustrator* remarks, that in this clause of the text, *we are in him that is true even in his Son Jesus Christ*, the word *even* is not in the original. This the translators have shewn in their usual way, as also in the 4th and 6th verses of the same chapter, but the sense remains the same if this word be omitted. Our author thinks if the last clause in this text, *This is the true God and eternal life*, be allowed to belong to our Lord Jesus Christ, as I think is evident from the text itself, it will flatly contradict those words of Christ recorded by the same apostle, John xvii. 3. *This is life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent.* “For how,” says he, “can the Father be the only true God, if the Son be true God also.” He might as well have asked, how the Son can be true God, if the Father be true God; for those terms *the true God, and the only true God* are of the same import and extent. If the Son be the *true God* as the apostle declares, then he is *the only true God*, for there is but *one true God*: And therefore no more can be fairly concluded from the description of the *Father* recorded in the gospel, than may be concluded from the description of the *Son* recorded in the epistle. It is worthy observation, that in both these texts *eternal life* is said to consist in the knowledge of Jesus Christ, as well as in the knowledge of the Father. Eternal life is often spoken of in scripture as flowing from the knowledge of God, and I think it to be some confirmation of the doctrine I am defending, that such language is likewise used with respect to our Lord, though it is never applied to any mere teacher of God’s will, however honoured with credentials of infallibility.

122. In the *illustration* of Phil. ii. 5, &c. a new translation of the words *he thought it no robbery to be equal with God* is still insisted on, p. 39; but no no-

* Rev. iii. 7, and xix. 11. compared with ch. vi. 10. and xv. 4.]

† Ch. v. 8, 13, § Ch. vii. 17, and xxi. 22, 23.

tice is taken of the arguments brought, in answer to the *appeal*, to prove, that no good sense can be made of the whole passage without allowing the divinity of Christ. Till this is done, I may be excused from adding any thing to what I have already said on this portion of scripture in my *short defence*.

23. In answer to our author's comment on that declaration of our Lord mentioned John x. 38. *I and my Father are one*, I shewed in my *short defence*, that such an union subsisted between the Father and Christ, as no mere man could have with God. All the reply to this which I find in the *illustration* (except what is included in the exposition of John xvii. 5. p. 40) is, that "They are one in design and interest. But whatever be the union between the Father and the Son; it is of such a kind, that his disciples are capable of it with respect to them both; for, in his prayer for his disciples, he says, John xvii. 20. *Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also which shall believe on me through their word: that they all may be one as thou Father art in me, and I in thee; that they also may be one in us—and the glory which thou gavest me, I have given them; that they may be one even as we are one. I in them, and thou in me, that they may be made perfect in one, and that the world may know that thou hast sent me, and hast loved them as thou hast loved me.*" p. 24. This passage, as many others, speaks of the union which all true christians have with each other, and with Christ: they are one body, of which he is the head; and *out of his fulness they receive grace for grace*. It likewise declares the love which the Father hath to all such, who are become his children by adoption and grace. But it does not assert that the disciples are capable of the same union with the Father and Christ, which subsists between them; and many other passages of scripture evince that they are not, as I have already shewn in my *short defence*, p. 20, 21. I would beg leave to ask the *illustrator* whether he thinks any disciple is capable of such an union with the Father, that the Holy Ghost may be called *his* spirit with as great propriety

as he is called the spirit of God? Yet this is the case with respect to Christ. Rom. viii. 9. May it with propriety be said, that the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, by which the prophets foretold the great things which are come to pass, was the inspiration of the spirit of Paul, or Peter, or any other disciple? Yet this inspiration was from the spirit of Christ. 1 Pet. i. 11. Or has the greatest saint that ever entered heaven such an union with the Father, that he can claim the power of commissioning, sending, and directing the Holy Ghost, who is God himself? Yet such union has Christ with the Father that he may speak of the Holy Ghost as his messenger, who takes of his, and shews it unto the disciples. John xvi. 14. Indeed our author has invalidated his own argument, as I before observed he must necessarily do,* in his exposition of John v. 23. *That all men should honour the Son even as they honour the Father.* The expression *even as*, upon the meaning of which the force of his reasoning in his last argument entirely depends, signifies, he says, *as well as*: and then adds, "The same word is used where it can have no other sense in" John xvii. 24. *And hast loved them as thou hast loved me*; that is, not in the same degree, but *likewise*." So that according to his own interpretation, all that the passage above quoted from John xvii. declares is this, that as there is an union between the Father and Christ, so likewise there is an union of the disciples with each other and with Christ; and as the Father loveth Christ, he likewise loveth the disciples: But not that the *same* union subsists between the disciples and Christ, as between Christ and the Father; or that the Father loveth the disciples with the *same* love, with which he loveth the Son.

24. The *illustrator* endeavours to weaken the arguments drawn from some of the texts in which the peculiar titles of God are applied to Christ, by introducing a new translation of them. How far his translations agree with the originals, I shall leave to the de-

* *Short defence*, p. 21.

termination of the learned. The unlearned, for whom he professes to write, can only judge of their propriety by their agreement with the context, and other passages of scripture; and in this view alone I shall consider them.

The glorious titles given to our Saviour in Isaiah ix. 6. *The mighty God, the everlasting Father*, our author says may be rendered "*the mighty God is my Father for ever.*" p. 30. To read the passage with this translation seems to me sufficient to shew its impropriety. *His name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor*, the mighty God is my father for ever, *the Prince of Peace*. The text appears evidently to me to point out the true characters of Christ, to declare what he *was* or *should be*, by saying what he should be *called*, which is a form of expression very common in the scriptures. The title of *Everlasting Father* applied to Christ does not at all contradict the common doctrine of the Trinity, at this author supposes; for though he is not *the Father* with respect to the Godhead, yet he may with the greatest propriety be called *the everlasting Father*, with respect to all created beings, since he is the Creator, and in this sense, the Father of all, as I hope, has been sufficiently proved.

An argument of another kind is likewise used, in which the author considers the passage as rightly translated: he says, p. 29. "These titles may not express what *Christ is*, but what *God will manifest himself to be in him, and by him*; so that, in the dispensation of the gospel, God, the wise and benevolent author of it, will appear to be a wonderful counsellor, the everlasting father, and the prince of peace." All the reason he gives for thus expounding the text is, that there are some instances in scripture, where "names imposed by divine direction do not express any thing characteristic of the person on whom they are imposed," but which "were intended to be a memorial of some divine promise respecting things of a public and general concern." This remark is very true, but very foreign to the scope of the passage under consideration; for the inspired

penman is here giving us the characters of the Messiah, as the preceding and subsequent words plainly shew, and therefore these titles do express what *Christ is*. He who is *the Mighty God, the Everlasting Father, and the Prince of Peace*, is also *a child born, and a Son given to us, the government is upon HIS shoulders, and of the encrease of HIS government and peace there shall be no end.* ver. 6. 7.

25. The same kind of argument is used with respect to the name *Emmanuel* mentioned by St. Matthew, ch. i. 23. and, I think, with no greater propriety. For the evangelist having informed us, that the name *Jesus*, which the supposed father of Christ was commanded to give him, was significant of his character as the Saviour of sinners, adds, *Now all this was done, that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet, saying, Behold a virgin shall be with child, and shall bring forth a son, and they shall call his name Emmanuel, which being interpreted, is, GOD WITH US.* So that from the evangelist's exposition of the prophet we learn, that the title *God with us* was characteristic of our Lord; being, in effect, applied to him when a name was given him expressive of his mighty power to save, which none but he can claim who is *the only Saviour*. If. xliii. 11. and *the only wise God*. Jude 25.

26. The *illustrator* thinks it has been "fully demonstrated that in the original of 1 Tim. iii. 16. the text "was not, *God was manifest in the flesh*, but *who* was "manifest in the flesh." p. 38. Allowing this to have been the case, the sense of the text remains precisely the same; for the relative *who* must refer to *God*, as this is only antecedent in the passage to which it can refer. The apostle having concluded, in the 13th verse, his directions to Timothy concerning the choice of bishops and deacons, adds the reason why he gave him such particular instructions. *These things write I unto thee—that thou mayest know how thou oughtest to behave thyself in the house of God, which is the church of the living God, the pillar and ground of the truth:* And then concludes the passage with a summary description of the oeconomy of our redemption; *And without controversy great is the mystery of godliness. God was manifest in the flesh, justified in the spirit, seen of angels, preached unto the gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory.*

But our author does not rest his objections intirely upon this full demonstration, for he adds, "Besides, it is even literally true that *God was manifest in the flesh of Christ*,

" the

"the wisdom and power of God being conspicuous in him." If God was no otherwise in Christ than by a communication of wisdom and power to him, these words might have been said of Moses, or Elijah, Paul, or Peter, as well as of Christ; and the manifestation of God in the flesh here spoken of, instead of being a great mystery, as the apostle affirms, was no mystery at all. Besides, this interpretation of the first clause will by no means suit the subsequent clauses of the sentence; for upon this construction we must suppose the apostle to say, that wisdom and power were justified in the spirit, seen of angels, believed on in the world, and received up into glory, which are not applicable to a *quality*, but a *person*: on the contrary, if we suppose these things to be spoken of Christ as a mere man, we must imagine the apostle to tell us, that a man was manifest in the flesh, a piece of information which no one can think an inspired writer capable of giving. In short, whether the passage be translated as our author says it ought to be, or not, we can never make sense of it without allowing the doctrine of Christ's divinity.

27. In the *illustration* of Rom. ix. 5. *Whose are the fathers, and of whom, as concerning the flesh, Christ came, who is over all, God blessed for ever*, it is said, p. 32. "this may with equal propriety and truth be rendered, *God who is over all be blessed for ever*, the former sentence ending with the word *came*," The author thinks himself justified in making this alteration as "no ancient manuscripts are pointed," and as "it is usual with the apostle Paul to break out into a form of thanksgiving to God, after mentioning any remarkable instance of his goodness." The reader will observe that what is here alleged does not prove it necessary to alter our translation, but, at most, only affords an apology for making such an alteration: the text, as it stands in our bible, is allowed to be exactly conformable to the original; and the context, instead of affording any reason for the alteration, strongly inforces the contrary. The apostle here enumerating the privileges of the Jews, concludes the list with this, that Christ, as concerning the flesh, was descended from them. Now, on the supposition that Christ was but a mere man, the expression *as concerning the flesh* has no meaning at all; and we must believe the apostle to be here talking nonsense before we can admit such a supposition to be true. If any man, being asked from what family the king

king of England was descended, should answer, " that he " was, as concerning the flesh, of the house of Hanover;" would not such an one be justly thought to utter words which conveyed no idea to the enquirer? And to alter the last clause of the sense as our *illustrator* has done, is to make the apostle's language equally improper; for there remains after such an alteration no antithesis in the passage to give the phrase *as concerning the flesh* any proper meaning: Whereas there is the greatest propriety in the expression, as the text stands in our bible: Christ, *as concerning the flesh*, that is, with respect to his human nature, is of the seed of Abraham; but with respect to his divine nature he is *God over all blessed for ever*.

28. " It is with little appearance of reason," says the *illustrator*, p. 23. " that Christ is argued to be very and " eternal God, because he is styled the *Son of God*, for all " christians have the same appellation." If no intimation was given us, that this title belongs to Christ in a higher sense than it does to all christians, certainly nothing could be argued from it to prove any superiority of nature in Christ; but we have abundant intimation in scripture that this title belongs to him in a sense peculiar to himself. The Jews were well accustomed to the title *sons of God*, for it is a common appellation of the saints in the Old Testament; and therefore when they accused our Lord of blasphemy for saying *that God was his Father*, they understood him in such a sense as could belong to no mere man whatever: And, I think, it is very plain that our Lord never undeceived them, if they mistook his meaning in such expressions. Our author says in his *Triumph of truth*, p. 19. " IF Christ had not satisfied the Jews that " he did not mean to make himself equal with God, would " they not have produced it against him at his trial, when " he was condemned as a blasphemer, because he confessed he was the Christ only." That the Jews did produce this as an accusation against him appears evident to me from the answer which they gave to Pilate, when he would have released our blessed Saviour, as finding no fault in him. *The Jews answered him, we have a law, and by our law he ought to die, because he made himself the SON OF GOD* John xix. 7. What the Jews here meant by the term *Son of God* may be learnt from their own declarations recorded in the 5th and 10th chapters. In the former they interpret our Lord's claim to this title as mak-

ing himself equal with God,* v. 18; and in the latter they call it still more plainly the *making himself God*. v. 33. We have therefore the greatest reason for believing this to be their meaning in their answer to Pilate. Besides, the Jews had no law to condemn our Lord for claiming this title in its ordinary signification. God had often declared himself the Father of all that trusted in, and obeyed him; and had repeatedly called such his sons. The Jews therefore could not say *By our law he ought to die, because he made himself the SON OF GOD*, if they used this appellation in its ordinary signification. But their law did condemn him to death for using such language concerning himself as they understood it, which was, *that he being a man only, made himself God*: And therefore it is plain that “Christ had not satisfied the Jews that he did not mean to make himself equal with God,” because they produced it against him at his trial, when he was condemned as a blasphemer.”

29. I have now taken notice, I think, of every material observation made in the *illustration* upon those passages of scripture which I have quoted in my *short defence*. My plan would not allow me to transcribe all that the *illustrator* says upon each of those passages: what I have transcribed conveys, in my apprehension, the force of his objections; however, the reader may easily satisfy himself by comparing these remarks with the *illustration*.

The following texts of scripture, urged in my *defence* of the divinity of Christ, are not taken notice of in the *illustration*. Rev. i. 17. p. 8. Heb. vii. 3. p. 9. Rev. xxii. 16. ib. Matt. xxii. 45. p. 9. Isaiah xl. 3. p. 10. Heb. ii. 18. p. 12. John x. 28. ib. Rev. ii. 24. p. 12. Luke xvii. 5. p. 14. Rom. x. 13—15. p. 15. 2 Thess. ii. 16. p. 16. 2 Cor. xii. 8. 9. ib. Rev. v. 8. 11, &c. p. 17. 2 Cor. viii. 9. p. 20. 1 Pet. i. 10. p. 22. John xvi. 7, 14. 15. p. 22. Jude xxv. p. 23. Rev. vii. 7. ch. xxi. 22, 23, p. 25.

30. Before I conclude, I shall take some notice of two other texts which our author has *illustrated*, though they

* Our author renders this expression *like unto God*, and supposes, that the Jews only meant hereby to charge our Lord with “assuming so much of God’s prerogative, as to claim the privilege of working on the sabbath-day:” Whereas the text plainly refers this charge to our Lord’s saying, that God was his Father; and not to his working on the sabbath. *Therefore the Jews sought the more to kill him, because he not only had broken the sabbath, but said also, that God was his Father, making himself equal with God.*

are

are not mentioned in my *defence*. The first is Col. ii. 9. *In him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily*. To suppose, as the *illustrator* does, p. 22. that this text implies no more than that "the wisdom and power of God" were manifest in, and acted by Christ," is, in my opinion, doing great injustice to it. It expresses, in the strongest manner, that incomprehensible indwelling of the deity in the human nature of Christ, which no mere man can partake of, and which renders him the proper object of worship to all intelligent creatures. The great privileges of true christians, though spoken of in terms, which at first sight appear similar to this, are found widely different, when attentively considered. God dwelleth in the saints, but it is only by a communication of divine grace, or holy love, as the apostle declares 1 John iv. 12, *If we love one another, God dwelleth in us*: And again, ver. 16. *He that dwelleth in love, dwelleth in God, and God in him*. So the being filled with the fulness of God, mentioned in Eph. iii. 19. is explained in the same passage to be *Christ's dwelling in their hearts by faith, knowing the love of God, and being rooted and grounded in love*. Besides, it is from Christ we receive these divine benefits, as is intimated in the words immediately following the text under consideration; *Ye are complete in him*; and still more plainly in other passages, as John i. 16. *Of his fulness have all we received, and grace for grace*: And Eph. iv. 7. *Unto every one of us is given grace according to the measure of the gift of Christ*. But how different is all this from what is here said of Christ: That the Godhead, or Deity itself, yea all the fulness of Deity, dwelleth in him bodily. "This expression," says our author, "that the fulness of the Godhead dwelled or resided in him, seems to imply that it did not naturally belong to him."* p. 23. It implies no more, I think, than that the Godhead and manhood of Christ, though united in one person, are not confounded; which is intimated in the phrase *dwelleth in him* BODILY.

* The *illustrator* likewise says, p. 46. "To signify that the authority of Christ is not underived, like that of God; and at the same time to inform us from whence it does proceed, the apostle says, that *it pleased the Father, that in him should all fulness dwell*." Col. i. 19. Our author might have added, that the word *Father* is not in the original of this text, as the English reader may observe by the character in which it is printed in our bibles. It pleased the Father without doubt, that the fulness of the Godhead should dwell in Christ bodily; but how does this prove that Christ has no underived authority.

The word *bodily* fixes the sense of the passage, since it could not have been used with propriety if Christ was but a mere man; for, in this case, it must either convey a false idea, or none at all; it must mean, that wisdom dwelt in his flesh and bones, or mean nothing. We should judge a writer to give a very improper and insignificant description of a wise or learned man by saying, that a great deal of wisdom or learning dwelt in him *bodily*: with still greater impropriety would the apostle have spoken of the *Godhead* dwelling in Christ *bodily*, if he had only meant, that Christ was possessed of a great measure of divine wisdom. Whereas, allowing the divine and human nature to be united in our Lord, the apostle's language has the greatest propriety, being descriptive of such an union.

31. The other text is, Acts xx. 28, *Feed the church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood.* The *illustrator* after telling us that in the most ancient manuscripts this text is, *Feed the church of the Lord*; and that in some copies it is, *which he purchased with blood*, adds, "As the blood of God is a phrase which occurs no where else in the scriptures, we ought to be exceedingly cautious how we admit such an expression. If Christ was God, his blood could not be his blood as God, but as man." p. 36. If we ought to be exceedingly cautious of admitting every expression that occurs but once in the scriptures, there are many besides this which must either be expunged, or regarded as of no consequence. It does not become us to say how often an expression must be repeated in the word of God before we will admit it. If God speaks, though but once, he requires our diligent attention, and intire credit. There is no danger that any should mistake the meaning of this passage, who accustom themselves to search the scriptures, or make use of their understanding. Such will readily comprehend, that by the *blood of God* is meant the *blood of him who is God*, though manifested to us in the flesh.* The scriptures abound with similar expressions; not only speaking such things of a person in general, as in truth can only be said of one part

* Some of my readers may perhaps wonder why I have not quoted upon this occasion, 1 John iii. 16. *Hereby perceive we the love of God, because he laid down his life for us.* My reason is, that as the word *God* is wanting in the greater part of the best editions of the New Testament which I have seen, I do not chuse to lay any stress upon it; though I think it very agreeable to the context to supply the ellipsis, which is in the original, by that word.

of him, which is a very common form of speech; but also applying to one of our component parts what solely appertains to the other. When it was said by Jesus that no SOUL should eat blood, or touch a dead body, the Jews were no more at a loss with respect to his meaning, than we are with regard to the apostle's, when he informs us, that *God purchased the church with his own blood*. A similar form of speech we find in John iii. 13; where our Lord calls himself the *Son of man*, when speaking of something which could not belong to him as man.

What our author alleges relating to ancient manuscripts I shall not now inquire into. Thousands, and tens of thousands in this kingdom have never seen an ancient manuscript of the Bible, nor, if they had, would have been the wiser for it; yet these, being capable of reading, and understanding the bible in their native language, are called to believe, and obey it, at the peril of their souls. To such I offer these remarks, which a belief of the importance of the subject have given rise to. I shall be extremely glad if they are instrumental, in the hands of him *who worketh all things after the counsel of his own will*, to the establishment of the wavering, or the reclaiming of the erroneous. Or if this attempt to vindicate the honour of our Redeemer shall excite others, who have greater abilities, and more leisure for such labours, to employ their talents in this important service, my design will be answered.



THE NATIONAL ARCHIVES

THE NATIONAL ARCHIVES